

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXIV

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1935

NUMBER 1088

Contents

The Week	225
Editorials	
Europe's Dance of Death.....	228
The Strike at Consumers' Research.....	230
Recovery or Ballyhoo?.....	231
General Articles	
Revolution with Reservations.....Oliver LaFarge	232
The Meadow Lark (verse).....Don Stanford	234
The People's Front in France.....Henri Fefevbre	235
Back to Panhandling.....J. O. Reade	237
Joe Louis Never Smiles.....Jonathan Mitchell	239
The Movies Join Hearst.....Selden C. Menefee	241
Cold History (verse).....Vincent McHugh	242
Washington Notes.....T. R. B.	243
Other People's Money.....John T. Flynn	244
On the Labor Front.....William P. Mangold	245
Correspondence	246
Soft Speech.....Stark Young	247
Books in Review	
The Road to Damascus.....Malcolm Cowley	248
Labor Boards.....Francis Biddle	249
One of the Few.....Eleanor Clark	250
Maimonides.....Harry S. Lewis	250
Young Prizeman.....Rolfe Humphries	251
Books in Brief.....	251

The Week

NOTHING has happened in the past seven days to justify the hope that open hostilities between Italy and Ethiopia can be averted. On Monday, Emperor Haile Selassie announced that in self-protection he felt it necessary to order a general mobilization. Following a request from the League, execution of the order was afterward suspended, but it can be restored at a moment's notice. A concentration of Italian troops was reported from a point near where Eritrea, French Somaliland and Ethiopia meet. Haile Selassie's request that neutral observers be stationed along the border so that the world may know the truth in case "an incident" takes place has thus far not been carried out. The League is going forward in accordance with the machinery of the Covenant, the presumption being that sanctions are to be applied to Italy in case she is guilty of a definite "act of aggression." Although Mussolini, obviously frightened by the concentration of British ships and airplanes in the eastern

Mediterranean, is seeking to avoid an open break at Geneva, his every act indicates an inflexible determination to fight in Ethiopia; he is pacifist only to the extent of seeking to avoid such a suicidal development as war with anybody else. He has threatened, however, to withdraw from the League at the moment when sanctions are applied.

WITH the war danger serious to the last degree, the Great Powers continue their diplomatic maneuvers, each seeking to get as much and to give as little as it possibly can. The British have confirmed to the French their intention to come to her aid if she is the victim of an overt act by Germany, and have in turn asked the French for a similar promise if Britain is attacked. Hitler, continuing to fish in troubled waters, still menaces Lithuania over the question of Memel, and current negotiations among Germany, Hungary and Poland are generally interpreted as hostile to the Little Entente and to Czechoslovakia in particular. The Nazi government, presumably because at the moment it feels particularly free from outside interference, has undertaken renewed measures against two groups of its "enemies"—Catholics and Jews. It is reported that two hundred leading Catholics have been arrested, and the few remaining Jews in the service of the German state railways—war veterans or fathers of soldiers—have been dismissed. The international skies, already so black, have been further darkened by developments in regard to naval armament among the United States, Great Britain and Japan. While formal negotiations regarding the new naval conference stipulated in the Washington Treaty are going forward, Japan has already denounced the Treaty and it seems clear that Great Britain will do so in the near future. President Roosevelt sufficiently indicated American pessimism by announcing, in effect, that if what the world wants is a building race, the United States is prepared at any cost to maintain equality with Great Britain and superiority over Japan.

PRESIDENT Roosevelt's Western tour is, of course, the opening gun of the 1936 campaign. Everyone knows that the President's popularity has declined in recent months and that his tour was intended to let him state his case to the people and,

by a series of personal appearances, demonstrate the falsity of rumors regarding his own health and spirits. Up to the time of our going to press, his public pronouncements have included the following:

The announcement, already referred to, that the United States will seek to maintain, with treaties or without them, the existing five-five-three ratio in naval strength among the United States, Great Britain and Japan.

A declaration that the A.A.A. and other agricultural policies of the administration have been of tremendous benefit to the farmer, with the insistence that the sort of help given under the A.A.A. is not only constitutional but is one of the fundamental human rights for which the American Revolution was fought. Republicans were prompt to offer the gratuitous theory that the President has now bound himself, if the Supreme Court should overthrow the A.A.A., as it seems likely to do, to base the 1936 campaign upon a new constitutional amendment specifically reaffirming its principles.

A promise that taxation will not be increased for the present unless the Supreme Court should make this necessary by overturning the A.A.A., thus forcing the government to find funds for farm payments elsewhere than in processing taxes. This promise was embodied in a summary of the budget situation, issued in Washington, which also reported a decrease of a billion and a quarter dollars in the estimated deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and predicted declining deficits thereafter.

A demand that private industry shall speed up the process of reemployment, this demand being based upon the theory that the depression is now ending and that government relief projects will be steadily diminished in the future.

A defense of the credit both of the federal government and of smaller governmental units, which he asserted is thoroughly sound.

A tacit promise to complete four great federal enterprises, presumably Boulder Dam, Muscle Shoals, Grand Coulee and the St. Lawrence project.

A suggestion that a federally owned transmission line from Boulder Dam through southern Nevada should be instituted to serve as another yardstick as to prices and services offered by private electric companies.

While the President was thus defending his public-utility policy, the holding-company law, one of its chief parts, was under bitter attack in Baltimore, Maryland. The utilities, through a smart legal trick which they may have bitter cause to regret, brought the constitutionality of the law into court in a case involving a bankruptcy reorganization, in such a way that the government was not one of the chief parties in the litigation. A feature of this case, on which we comment elsewhere in this issue, was the fact that government attorneys, charging collusion between the litigants, were able to show that John W. Davis, the utilities' chief counsel, had not even met his ostensible client, Dr. Ford Lautenbach, a Baltimore dentist who seemed to know singularly little about the proceedings in which he was allegedly a principal.

A POLITICAL activity of the President which may cause him some embarrassment was his form letter to large numbers of clergymen asking their advice and coöperation. This was an imitation of a plan that Mr. Roosevelt used to great advantage while still Governor of New York. It was promptly pointed out that his letter was identical in several passages with a similar one sent by Governor La Follette of Wisconsin to clergymen in that state some months ago. Other political developments of the week included a statement by William Randolph Hearst, who only a short time ago wanted Al Smith to run for the presidency as a Conservative Democrat, and now wants Governor Landon of Kansas to run as a Conservative Republican. From Mr. Hoover's friends came renewed assurances that he is not a candidate for the Republican nomination next year. Similar assurances have been given in the past, but the country obstinately refuses to accept them until they are uttered by the Sage of Palo Alto himself.

THE public utilities figured in two other important developments of the week, in New Jersey and New York City. John Crempa, a Polish-American landowner of Scotch Plains, New Jersey, has for years been quarreling with the Public Service Corporation of New Jersey over a power line which that company has built across his land. A few days ago eight armed deputy sheriffs, acting primarily though not technically in the interest of the P.S.C., approached the Crempa house and threw tear-gas bombs. The deputies say that the Crempa family rushed out of doors and began shooting, and that they fired in self-defense; but this is denied by members of the family and by neighbors. At any rate, the deputies shot and killed Mrs. Crempa. The daughter of the family, who attempted to commit suicide following the death of her mother, charges that she and her father were subsequently tortured by the deputy sheriffs over a long period of time, and that one of them deliberately shot off the tip of one of her father's fingers. She also charges that these men stole nearly \$500 that was in the house. Crempa and his daughter have both been arrested, and one of the deputies is being held charged with manslaughter. The case has aroused deep public feeling in New Jersey, where the P.S.C. has for years been a dominating influence.

IN New York City, Supreme Court Justice Dore has forbidden the referendum among the citizens, which was to have taken place in November, on the question of a municipal power plant. He has done so on the singular ground that if the referendum took place, and if the power plant were then constructed without a pledge of the city's credit behind it, this act would be illegal. The city will appeal from the decision, although Mayor LaGuardia has pessimistically observed that a joker in the state law makes it probable that Justice Dore will be sustained. Other developments in the week's na-

tional news include the vote for a strike among New Orleans longshoremen, with the likelihood that similar action may soon follow in San Francisco and other Pacific Coast ports. The strike of soft-coal miners, as we report elsewhere, has been settled. Major George Berry is added to the rapidly growing list of persons who have been successively appointed by the President to coördinate recovery activities. The Department of Justice announces a nationwide drive against various forms of racketeering. The President and other speakers at the beginning of the annual Mobilization for Human Needs demanded that private charity should take over an increasing share of relief for destitution; at present, such charity bears less than five percent of the burden, whereas before 1929 it carried from 25 to 30 percent.

ON THE eve of his departure for the West, President Roosevelt made public the list of articles subject to embargo under the new neutrality legislation in case of war. It included only actual arms, ammunition, tanks, airplanes and their parts. It is understood, however, that this is a preliminary list, to which additions can and probably will be made later. The Department of Commerce is now studying the economic effects of an embargo that would embrace raw materials such as cotton, copper, steel and chemicals. The President's haste in issuing the preliminary list was based upon the fact that manufacturers, exporters and importers of products subject to embargo must be put under license by December 1, and it was deemed advisable to get the project under way. Meanwhile, it is increasingly clear that the United States has only a faint chance of keeping out of the next large-scale war, and that this chance will be reduced almost to zero if we attempt to sell raw materials to belligerents. American pacifists are confronted by the one great opportunity and duty of their lives. They should insist that however painful the consequence to business men who want to make fat profits, in case of war the United States shall suspend all trade in any product useful for war purposes. Already, we are engaged in heavy exports to Italy of this character, and our present improvement in business conditions in certain areas is partly attributable to this fact.

ESSENTIALLY the meaning of President Roosevelt's statement on naval policy last week is that, if he is reëlected, he will engage in a building race with Japan. What he said was that in the event that other nations exceed the present five-five-three ratio upon the expiration of the Washington treaties next year, the United States will be compelled to change its existing program. We are to build, he implies, only if Japan makes the first hostile move. But the practical effect of such a policy will be to place our naval program at the mercy of the self-interested propaganda of munitions makers, both here and in Japan. This country will be flooded with reports of secret, alarming naval preparations

by the Japanese, and the public in Japan will be fed with the same rumors. Both governments will protest that they are only building defensively, but the certain result will be a naval race.

MR. Roosevelt has never yet given the detailed reasons for his conviction that we must maintain a five-to-three naval superiority over the Japanese. It cannot be for the defense of the Pacific coastline, which all experts agree is invulnerable to an attacker who has no naval bases on this continent. Presumably the necessity for a great navy comes from our supposed need to protect our trade with China. Japan's policy during the last three years has indicated unmistakably that it means to dominate China, and control its relations with the outside world. But even if this is admitted, it is hard to see how a navy, or even the military conquest of Japan by the United States, would materially benefit American commercial interests. The greater part of our trade with China is made up of necessities that the two countries would exchange in any event. If the Japanese extend their control over China, they will be likely to set themselves up as middlemen and attempt to extract a margin of profit on Chinese-American commerce. But that small profit will not conceivably be worth a war, nor, for that matter, worth the billion a year we now spend to maintain and extend our grotesquely swollen naval establishment.

THE dispute between public-utility holding-company officials and lawyers on the one side, and government officials advocating abolition of some holding companies and regulation of others, still continues. It flamed anew in the federal court at Baltimore, when John W. Davis, counsel for the Edison Electrical Institute, appeared to contest the constitutionality of the recent act of Congress dealing with the holding companies. Government lawyers charged that the test proceeding brought by Mr. Davis in behalf of a bondholder was so arranged that the government was not a party to the proceedings. It could take part in the case only on sufferance, by permission of the judge, and without that legal standing which would have enabled it to have as much of a voice in guiding the litigation as "parties" normally have. The distinction, though a technical one, is of substantial importance. It takes on added significance from the great weight of the policies underlying the statute in question, and from the fact that a ruling of unconstitutionality affects the power of Congress to act in other fields also. To conduct a test case of this nature in a proceeding in which the government is placed at a distinct disadvantage is clearly undesirable. The government has charged that the suit is in fact a collusive one, and that the court should decline to entertain trial of the issue of constitutionality, leaving it for some subsequent case in which the government is a party. Judge Coleman, while seemingly unconvinced by the evidence on the question of col-

lusion, reserved decision on this point. It will probably be raised again in the United States Supreme Court, in the event that an appeal is taken to that Court. One disadvantage under which the government labors is that it has not the right to appeal.

WITH a strike of only four days' duration, but involving 400,000 soft-coal miners in twenty-eight states, the United Mine Workers of America last week brought to a successful conclusion their negotiations for a new contract covering the bituminous industry. The new contract provides for an increase in the basic daily wage from \$5 to \$5.50 and for a corresponding increase of roughly ten percent in piece-work rates. These wages are not, of course, nearly so munificent as they appear. Miners in the bituminous coal fields rarely work as many as 200 days in a year—last year in the Pittsburgh area, which is the best paid, they worked only 165 days with an average annual income of only \$825. The increases granted in the new agreement will bring the average annual income up to around \$900. This is to be compared with a family budget of \$1,600, generally regarded as a minimum budget to keep a family on a bare subsistence level. Moreover, the new contract does little in the way of solving the unemployment problem that exists in the coal industry. The miners had asked for a six-hour day (hoping thereby to provide employment for some of the 300,000 now unemployed) but they were forced to continue the seven-hour day. But despite these qualifications, the strike must be considered as a demonstration of the value of a strong union. Since early April the miners had relied on promises of the administration that the Guffey coal bill would automatically bring them higher wages. But rather than wait for the coal board, they used their own organization, which is the largest and strongest union in the country, to win these demands.

IN THE sporadic warfare carried on by the newspapers against the radio—in spite of the politeness of surface relations—it seems to us that the newspapers are on the horse-and-buggy end. Science will eventually outstrip them. Fresh indication of this is afforded by recent developments in the field of facsimile transmission by radio. Photographs have been transmitted by wireless since 1926, though the process never has been wholly satisfactory because the almost inevitable variations in signal strength (fading) produce a consequent blurring and distortion in the picture. Transmission of drawings, holographic documents, printed matter, blue prints, charts, etc., however, has been much more successful because this involves the simple difference between black and white rather than the gradations of half-tone engravings. Radio facsimile circuits are now in operation between New York and London, San Francisco, Berlin and Buenos Aires, and other points of the globe. Recent experimentation has been concentrated on the use of ultra-short waves (which are completely free

from fading) as a carrier signal; and the development of a practicable home-receiving apparatus.

GREAT success has been reported in both directions. Competent engineers say that a comparatively inexpensive attachment has been developed and may presently be offered for addition to the home radio set. During the hours when sound broadcasting normally ceases, from one to six in the morning, a radio newspaper-printing attachment could be turned on and a complete metropolitan newspaper would be ready in the morning. A variation would be to have the radio-newspaper apparatus run separately throughout the day, receiving the news bulletins (possibly along with advertising, as a means of financing the enterprise) as they occur. The ultimate social implications of any such developments are, of course, tremendous. In time, the pressure for freedom of the press may become mere shadow-boxing. The real issue may be freedom of the radio.

Europe's Dance of Death

LAST WEEK the European chancelleries functioned at high speed. The English and French reached an understanding according to which France will apparently withdraw its support from Italy, and in return the British will abstain from further independent negotiations with Hitler. Mussolini seems left in a dangerously isolated position. Hitler's reply to the renewed Anglo-French entente was to summon Premier Goemboes of Hungary to Berlin, and it is reported that a German-Polish-Hungarian alliance is in prospect.

Tangible proof that the English and French once more have a working agreement was given by a letter from Sir Samuel Hoare, British Foreign Minister, to M. Charles Corbin, the French Ambassador at London, purporting to outline England's permanent policy in Europe. It is phrased with typical diplomatic ambiguity, and commits England to no new course of action. It points out with great care that a breach of a treaty cannot be regarded as an act of aggression, calling for sanctions under the League of Nations. This is obviously a reference to Germany's rearmament in violation of the Treaty of Versailles, which the British have repeatedly condoned. The principle laid down, however, would be of crucial importance in the event of a Nazi coup in Austria. Now that Mussolini's energies are being absorbed by East Africa, it is likely that he will be compelled to lessen his support of Prince von Starhemberg and the Austrian Heimwehr. The Nazis in Austria, financed by Hitler, may soon make a new bid for power, and their success would undoubtedly be followed by an attempt at Anschluss, which would be a violation of several treaties. By the terms of Sir Samuel's letter, England apparently would not regard this as a cause for military intervention.

It is a mistake, however, to attach too great significance to Sir Samuel's exact phraseology. What he is writing about is war and peace, and no nation has ever made war, or refrained from making war, because of a legal phrase. The significant fact about his letter is that it should have been written at all. It would not have been published if England and France had not arrived at a common policy for the immediate future. From the attitude displayed by M. Laval at Geneva, it seems clear that France has at last agreed to join England in opposing Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia. In return, England will give a highly qualified support to France against Hitler.

Had this understanding between England and France been arrived at last May, it is entirely possible that Mussolini would never have embarked the youth of Italy for East Africa. His whole strategy was founded on the belief that he would have the continuing support of France, and now that this support is withdrawn, he finds himself in a hopeless diplomatic position. Further intransigence on his part carries with it the theoretical possibility of war with England, and the ultimate ruin of his regime. It is of no consequence that Mussolini's bombing planes could destroy Malta, that his submarines could defend Italy's coastline, that his swift cruisers would be more than a match for those of England. Whatever his victories at the start of such a war, within three months he would be defeated by England's immense superiority in manpower and materials.

Despite the truculence of the Fascist newspapers in Rome, it is probable that during the last few days Mussolini has been engaged in frantic negotiations in Paris and London. It is not difficult to guess what his arguments have been. Probably he has been saying that if he withdraws his troops without a battle, it will damage the white man's prestige throughout Africa. Probably he has been pleading for a "little war," a quick triumph at Adowa, and the occupation of a strip of territory along the Eritrean and Somaliland frontiers, after which he will bring his men home. He has publicly offered to give England guarantees that he will not infringe upon any of its "legitimate interests" in East Africa.

There is a danger, however, that the Ethiopian situation is not longer controllable. The essential anarchy of Europe prevents the solution of conflicts once they have passed a certain stage. The British are now prisoners of their words at Geneva in the same way that Mussolini is of his at Rome. They cannot publicly agree even to a "little war" between Italy and Ethiopia without giving the lie to their recent protestations of loyalty to the League. More important, under the European diplomatic ritual, they cannot seem to yield without its being interpreted as evidence of weakness. While the British refuse all talk of compromise, Mussolini is penitent. Once they become "reasonable," he might regain his former belligerence.

The situation in Ethiopia itself must also be taken into account. Haile Selassie has shown remarkable coolness in the face of the vast Italian preparations to conquer his country. But he has now notified the League that he cannot much longer delay putting into effect the order for mobilization, which it is estimated will take nearly a month. After his men have heard the beating of their village drums, the war cannot be called off whenever half a dozen diplomats, meeting in some European capital, decide they are in agreement. While it is doubtful that the Ethiopians can ever defeat the Italians in battle, because of the great disparity in their armaments, they can make it dangerous for Mussolini to recall any large number of his troops for many months to come.

There is probably not a responsible diplomat in Europe who wants to see sanctions applied against Mussolini. If it could be arranged, every one of them would like to see him enjoy a victory at Adowa, and win a "little war." The British themselves are immensely fearful lest the outcome of the present situation should be to overthrow his regime, and bring about a revolution in Italy. But there is no such thing as unified political leadership in Europe, no clear line of political precedent to be followed, and no certain means of curbing the forces now set in motion.

Premier Goemboes' visit to Berlin must be set down as the first result of Mussolini's African adventure. For the last ten years, Mussolini has acted as Hungary's protector, and furnished her with illegal arms and military airplanes. Presumably Goemboes realizes that, because of her campaign in Africa, Italy's influence in the Balkans will be fatally weakened for a long time to come, and that he must seek a new Great Power as an ally for Hungary. It happens that Goemboes himself is a great admirer of Hitler and the Nazi race doctrines, and he is reported to be strongly anti-Semitic. But Hungary is surrounded by the hostile states of the Little Entente, and even if Goemboes despised Hitler, he would still need Germany's protection.

The shift of Hungary from the area of Italian influence to that of German influence, if it occurs, will necessarily set off a long train of highly explosive consequences, beside which the Ethiopian crisis is of limited importance. A German-Polish-Hungarian alliance would isolate Czechoslovakia, which is the focus of French investments in eastern Europe. Czechoslovakia has a powerful German minority, and it is there that the rivalry of France and Germany reaches its greatest heights. A German-Hungarian alliance will also directly affect Rumania and Yugoslavia, the two partners of Czechoslovakia in the Little Entente. All of the Little Entente countries have recently concluded agreements with Soviet Russia, and they are undoubtedly now trying to obtain renewed assurances of Russian support. Until more facts are known, it is futile to speculate on the precise alignments that will emerge from the present crisis. But what

no one can ignore is that with each new shock in Europe, the division between the French and German groups becomes sharper, readjustments of influence harder to achieve and the possibility of a general war more ominous.

The Strike at Consumers' Research

WHEN THE employees of Consumers' Research walked out on strike a month ago, as reported in *The New Republic* of September 18, there were many friends of "CR" to whom the news seemed utterly incredible. Consumers' Research, as an organization, and its directors, as individuals, had always been thought of as friends of labor. Indeed, the very function of CR in exposing fraudulent advertising and shoddy merchandise—a job it has performed admirably and for which *The New Republic* has praised it highly—would seem to demand an alliance with workers (the great mass of consumers) against the proprietary interests. And obviously such an alliance would require, on CR's part, not merely lip service to the cause of labor but fair treatment of its employees.

It now appears, however, that Consumers' Research will not bargain collectively with its staff unless, apparently, it is forced to by great pressure from its subscribers. The forty-three union members who went on strike have been locked out and virtually told that they need not expect to be reemployed. Meanwhile, CR has blocked all efforts to arbitrate or settle the dispute and has actually announced that the "situation is beyond arbitration." This is difficult to believe, for the demands of the strikers are neither unreasonable nor unusual. They are asking for recognition of the union—Local 20055 of the Technical, Editorial and Office Assistants' Union of the A.F. of L.—and for reinstatement of three union members, including the president, who they believe were discharged for union activity. It would seem that these demands could be arbitrated, but Consumers' Research has answered them with armed guards from a strike-breaking detective agency, an injunction against picketing and, in general, an uncompromising policy of strike-breaking. The excuse has been that the striking union harbors "thugs" and Communists, has plans to bomb the CR plant in Washington, New Jersey, and has threatened to commit murder and mayhem on the persons of the "loyal" (non-striking) CR employees.

These are undeniably serious charges. Can Consumers' Research prove them? We have examined a lengthy statement recently sent by the board of directors to the 60,000 CR subscribers and we have also examined a detailed reply prepared by the strikers and obtainable by writing to the union at Box 144, Washington, New Jersey. The statement issued by CR, we regret to say, falls somewhat short

of the accuracy and objectivity that one usually credits to CR pronouncements. Certainly it leaves considerable room for doubt as to whether the violent anti-union policy of CR is justified. To cite a few examples:

1. The board's statement declares that "the union refuses all arbitration." This is wholly inaccurate; the union has publicly announced its willingness to have the dispute arbitrated by an impartial committee. Thus far, however, all attempts at mediation or arbitration have been resisted by the directors of CR.

2. It is charged that the union is under Communist leadership and that the strike is revolutionary in purpose. The union is an accredited local of the American Federation of Labor, which, if we know President William Green, still frowns on revolutions. In any event it is our understanding that Communists, even if employed by CR, still have the right to join unions.

3. The board charges that one of the revolutionary aims of the strike is to capture control of CR, as evidenced by the union's request that "one of its own members, Dewey Palmer," be put on the board of directors. This does sound rather presumptuous of the union unless one happens to know that Mr. Palmer was a member of the board until a few days before the strike, when he was dismissed because he refused to sign a statement accusing the union of blackmail. The union is merely asking for his reinstatement. The board's statement fails to provide subscribers with this explanation, nor does it mention the fact that the same request has been made by some twenty CR employees who are not in the union. In all, sixty of the seventy on CR's staff have petitioned for Mr. Palmer's reinstatement.

4. The board charges that a further revolutionary aim of the strike is to destroy CR and set up a Communist-controlled organization. It is suggested that the union is relying on the support of advertising interests and of the United States Chamber of Commerce to accomplish this end. The Chamber of Commerce can probably take care of itself in this, but for the union it can reliably be said that nothing in its conduct during the strike justifies the charge. It has not only turned down contributions to its strike fund from opponents of CR, though money is desperately needed, but it has steadfastly refused to criticize or disparage the work and achievements of CR. Especially impressive as evidence of good faith on the part of the union is the fact that it has asked subscribers not to cancel their subscriptions because of the strike. The union, in brief, has confined itself to the issues of collective bargaining—recognition of the union, improved working conditions and reinstatement of its president and two other discharged union members. Through collective bargaining the union hopes to put an end to the great insecurity that exists among CR employees at present—insecurity induced by a labor policy that has caused a turnover of nearly

100 percent in CR's staff in the last two years. The board's statement is silent on this point.

This summary does not, of course, cover all the issues in dispute. On the basis of available evidence, however, it does not seem too much to say that Consumers' Research, though it has indicted its striking employees on many counts, has also placed itself on trial. The directors of CR declare that they are willing to let CR subscribers be the jury. This offer is not impressive. The subscribers have heard only one side of the story, CR's side, and they have no voice in CR's management. They can, of course, write letters of protest threatening to cancel subscriptions unless the strike is quickly settled and they can join the Association of Consumers' Research Subscribers (Room 1911, 104 Fifth Avenue, New York City), which has been formed to bring a satisfactory settlement of the strike. But in the circumstances arbitration by an impartial committee suggests itself as the most appropriate method of reaching a prompt and fair decision.

It is to be hoped that the directors of CR will speedily approve such a course. Consumers' Research has important work to perform—work that may be jeopardized, if not discredited, by failure to settle the strike satisfactorily. An organization devoted to the service of consumers (most of whom, naturally, are workers) can hardly expect to enlist their support on a basis of strike-breaking and refusal to bargain collectively.

Recovery or Ballyhoo?

ONCE AGAIN, the newspapers have decided that the depression is over. A concerted ballyhoo stronger than we have seen at any time since the spring of 1933 is being utilized to strengthen and extend that return of business confidence which undoubtedly does exist. The government is both participating in these declarations—as witness President Roosevelt's letter to Roy Howard and several of his speeches on his Western trip—and basing its policy on the assumptions that things are now getting better, as in the plans to taper off work relief, and virtually to abandon the public-works program.

While we hope, like everybody else, that the depressing is ending, we do not know whether it is or isn't. We are not impressed by voodoo like that of Charles G. Dawes, who, on the basis of no reliable evidence whatever, says depressions last about five years and five months. It is true that the banks are now in a position that would provide a basis for a vast credit inflation. It is also true that the people are spending larger amounts for amusements, travel, consumer goods in general and automobiles (in all of these and particularly the last, increased agricultural income is an important factor). On the other hand, we recall certain facts that rarely get into the headlines of the Optimism Press:

This depression has been and is substantially worldwide, exclusive of Russia. On a worldwide scale, as the League of Nations reports, there has been a steady slight improvement, but not enough to justify the assertion that hard times are over. Indeed, League experts point out that the present improvement could easily be wiped out by such adverse factors as war, currency difficulties or a sudden increase in political restrictions on trade such as embargoes, quotas, etc.

This is the fourth boom during the Roosevelt administration. Business has gone very slightly higher than in the third, a few points higher than in the second, and is still far from reaching the level attained briefly during the first.

Unemployment, according to all reliable indices, is at least as high as it was a year ago. One-fifth of our man-power is idle; one-sixth of our population is on relief.

Our export trade, which is of great importance in certain industries and areas, is still down by two-thirds.

Our building industry, which everyone agrees is a vital element in recovery, is still down by three-quarters.

Railroad revenues, an important index of conditions, are down by one-half.

Industrial production has regained only one-half its losses since the bottom of the depression. After moving steadily upward for thirty-five years, with minor recessions, it went back after 1929 to the level of 1895, and has now moved up again only to the level of the few years immediately preceding the Great War.

These facts do not justify unmitigated pessimism; but they do suggest that while such conditions continue, the announcement that we are now "back to normalcy" is still premature, to say the least. Over and over again, we have tried since 1929 to ballyhoo ourselves out of depression. Always in the past, these efforts have failed and have left us in worse case than before—worse, because under the hypnotic influence of this variety of Couéism, we have neglected long-range planning, have lessened our efforts to put our house in order, have assumed that all wrongs would right themselves. It is a policy that, in the light of experience, has little to commend it.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD R. G. TUGWELL LEWIS MUMFORD
JONATHAN MITCHELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

Revolution with Reservations

THE RESERVATIONS mentioned in the title are tracts of land—about 45,000,000 acres scattered about the United States—part fertile, part submarginal, much desert, the remnant of 155,000,000 acres upon which the surviving Indians were located in the 1860's and 1870's to hold forever in compensation for having lost the whole of the United States.

The revolution is primarily one of thought, gaining force and slowly reversing long established lines of action. It began to rumble and mutter perhaps twelve years ago, it became a nuisance to the powers that were, and first began to have real effect under Hoover. Until that time, the position of Commissioner of Indian Affairs had been a political plum to be handed to a good party member too dumb or too compliant to be entrusted with a job the public watched, and yet a man who had earned a fairly big post. Hoover broke the rule, appointing Charles J. Rhoads, with Henry Scattergood as Assistant Commissioner, reformers to whom their new offices meant serious financial sacrifices. Moving slowly of necessity, harassed by a Congress generally hostile to the administration, they laid the groundwork, made the necessary transition for the changes now taking place.

But to get any idea of what present developments mean, one must turn back to the days when the Indian Bureau was part of the War Department and its function an expression of the white man's wish—in any way whatsoever, though with a reasonable gloss of humanitarian gesture—to push down the great tribes whose love of home and freedom blocked our expansion. Indian agents of that day expected to, and did, make more money than their salaries warranted. Their business, the government's business, was to see to it that when whites wanted an area of land, they got it. No one cared about Indians anyway; they were a dark race, they were savage, they had what we wanted. The picture is clear. With the possible exception of the Navajos—and they are a special case—we have broken faith with almost every tribe in the United States, usually several times.

Any government bureau reflects the force of public opinion that attaches to it. Thus the Park Service pleases or annoys millions of voters annually by the way it is conducted; a lively and powerful lay organization keeps watch upon it, advises, supports, criticizes. The Park Service is alert, modern and well fed with public funds. But until recently there were only two bodies of public opinion bearing upon the Indian Service—the missionaries, and the people who wanted something the Indians had. As far as the rest of the country

was concerned, they could go hang. Mission interests cared—with exceptions—for little more than the making of Christians and the destruction of Indian culture and tradition. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the War Department and later under the Department of the Interior, became narrow, undisturbedly bureaucratic and all too acquiescent to the one group then really interested in the Indian question.

Bad wages, bad living and working conditions, a dead hand of rules and regulations with a stifling military inheritance, caused the Indian Service to become in part a repository for individuals not quite able to qualify for parallel positions elsewhere. To put it bluntly, from 40 to 60 percent of those who dealt with the Indians were their social and intellectual inferiors, some of them were mere time-servers, and an important group were completely disqualified for their work by race prejudice. This condition can be traced back to the founding of our government; with some improvements in personnel it was the dominant factor up to ten years ago. Its after-effects are still painfully obvious.

Any organization develops a corporate existence and philosophy of its own. An Indian policy came into being. It was the product of the times—generations of complete self-satisfaction with America and Americanism, cultural narrowness, religious intolerance, combined with the tendency to preserve in such a bureau outworn philosophies and stale ideas. For a century and a half our Indian policy could be stated as follows:

1. Our civilization is *the* civilization. Anything different is savage. Anyway, Indians are inferior. The quicker they become like us the better; they must become Christian, and in so far as the leopard can change his spots, cease to be Indians.

2. We still need land. Though we do not admit it, we do not intend to let these aborigines retain anything we want. Gold in the Black Hills? Farming land in Kansas? The agent will get the Indians to move, and if he can't do it, the army will.

While we were intermittently at war with the Indians, the two elements of policy were not reconciled, but alternated. The second part was bound in time to undergo a change. Meanwhile the first evolved. The tribes had always governed themselves, they had organization, tradition, pride and no little culture. All this was broken down. The children were, whenever possible, removed from the reservations to government boarding schools where they were forbidden to speak their own language, their culture was disparaged, religious education was compulsory and everything possible done to root out all pride of race, all memory of their

collective pasts. Schools—one might better call them penal institutions—where little children were sentenced to hard labor for a term of years to expiate the crime of being born of their mothers. I myself have visited in the not so distant past schools beside which Dotheboys Hall would be paradise.

An outmoded, rotten education completely dissociated from any problem the adult Indian would have to face, race prejudice and hard labor, institutionalization such as one finds in a penitentiary, destroying all responsibility, thought, initiative. A propaganda of shame towards that in which the children most craved, and needed, to take pride, produced warped and tortured personalities that sank back with relief into tribal ways, or remained adrift, neither white, Indian nor whole.

There was similar handling of the tribes, destruction with nothing offered in exchange. Hunters were told to farm land fit only for grazing; the game was destroyed. Indians learned to take orders, draw rations, let the government provide bare life. Life had no point and no future, one had no rights, religious ceremonies were forbidden, one's children came home strangers, treaties existed to be broken. Nothing to do but fold the hands and sit around, and let the government do its incalculable thinking.

As preparation for entering the life of the nation, this produced nothing but potential or actual charges upon the state. It was the easiest way for a bureaucracy to function, since it made it absolute. The policy was not thought through, nor was a goal stated, by anyone; it grew, partly by a bureau's natural tendency to plan its own perpetuation.

Meanwhile our consciences became more tender as we left the frontier conditions behind. In the 1870's we had most of the tribes on reservations comprising 155,632,312 acres, all guaranteed by promises and treaties. We wanted more land, but a show of legality became necessary. The missionary groups and small humanitarian organizations, whatever their faults, blocked the path of plain robbery. A few tribes were talked into ceding some 20,000,000 acres, but that was a mere drop. In the 1880's the allotment system was devised and sold to the humanitarians. The principle was beautifully simple. Indians hold land in common; we do not. Therefore common ownership is backward, primitive. The hunting tribes insist on moving around. Ownership of parcels will tie them down, they will farm, become like us; civilization will arrive overnight. So tribe after tribe was talked, high-pressured or coerced into accepting allotments—from 160 to 640 acres per head—and the remaining reservation lands, to a total of 60,000,000 acres, were declared "surplus" and thrown open to white settlement. It was swell.

The allottees were mainly individuals reared among wide horizons, unlimited land, free motion. They had no idea of our business or legal systems. Many of them had never farmed. Much of the land was fit only for large-scale grazing, a

single section of such territory being about as useful as one leg of a pair of pants. It is interesting to note that such people as the Navajos, whose deserts no one wanted, were not allotted lands.

When that game played out, we produced the "competency" idea, with much talk of giving the Indian his freedom. This theory was that if an Indian inherited an allotment from a previous allottee, or had held it for twenty-five years, he had miraculously acquired our peculiar civilization, and was declared "competent." His land ceased to be held in trust by the government, could be taxed, levied upon, sold or lost in any manner. The primitive allottees and the products of our beneficent educational system were both easy marks for the host of sharks who descended upon them. Between 1900 and 1933 we acquired a further 30,000,000 acres in this manner, despite earnest attempts under Commissioner Rhoads to slow the process. I omit a mass of noisome details; here we want the general background.

Of the total of 108,500,000 acres which we took from a conquered people since 1871, a large part is now blowing around the Middle West in dust clouds, or being bought as submarginal land by the A.A.A. The general process, then, was a logical one of stripping the Indians of the means of self-support while training them to be paupers. One hundred thousand of them are landless today. Rural slums, centers of disease, vice, hopelessness. It is proof positive of these people's extraordinary vigor that they still retain so much of their own culture, so much pride, hope and capacity for advancement.

That the basic fault was wrong thinking and lack of public opinion is shown by what two administrations—one not yet finished—have accomplished, preceded by the development of militant associations for Indian welfare working with or against the Bureau of Indian Affairs as circumstances indicated.

The Rhoads administration began bringing in experts and improving personnel. It made such revolutionary changes as putting a trained educator in charge of the key task of education—a post for which previously it had not been considered necessary even to have a college-educated man. A coherent, pro-Indian policy appeared. For the first time, the children in school were given enough to eat, and labor was reduced. Beginnings were made in opening day-schools at home, protecting land, helping the Indians to help themselves, giving them a chance to develop their own special talents. (The Santa Fé Indian School today sends exhibitions of paintings to Paris, by invitation.) This spadework done, they were followed by Commissioner John Collier, like his predecessors recruited from an Indian welfare association, and Assistant Commissioner William Zimmerman. The moment was propitious, with a friendly Congress and an atmosphere that tolerated experiments.

The primary necessary revolution in *thought* was made good, the new Indian policy moved towards forceful action. Though it could be covered by the statement that it is the old policy inside out, it is worth summarizing:

1. Beggars, homeless, hopeless and diseased, make poor material for any purpose. The means of a decent living—land, and tools and knowledge to use it—must be assured. An adequate health service must be maintained, though the advances made under Commissioner Rhoads are threatened by reduced appropriations.

2. An underprivileged but innately superior people, partly warped by long mis-handling, is to enter our machine civilization as contributors, able to enjoy life, and bringing with it gifts from its own civilization and special capacities. The problem is one of *education*, in the sense that includes learning self-government, management of herds, farms, minerals, forests; eventually even such services as health and direct education must be maintained by local effort and initiative, not received as blanket charities. Education must begin at home, in relation to tribal problems and needs, it must have direction, lead to responsibility and initiative, and start from the base of the Indians' own tradition, culture and pride.

3. From this arises the need of a favorable attitude on the part of the personnel generally—race or cultural prejudice, hostility to native arts, traditions, religions, are out.

Beginning with a shake-up of the top personnel, the new administration flew at it. The matter seems simple enough in statement, but it meant upsetting more than a century of tradition. Well meaning conservatives, some church groups and the active group that lives to prey upon the Indians, oppose it alike. And then, one must consider the atmosphere of the New Deal. The Indian Bureau is a complete little government in itself, which since March, 1933, has reflected the tone of the Roosevelt administration. It has been plagued by bright young men, attached to various departments, who found in this microcosm a chance to imitate what they conceived to be the roles of Brain-Trusters in the larger government. If a Brain-Truster has drawbacks, a sub-Brain-Truster is almost indescribable. Veteran employees have become suspicious, confused and disheartened; leading Indians, in many cases, were alarmed into hostility by these scintillations, and Congress' coöperation was nearly ruined when the same influence was applied to it.

Despite much backfiring and waste motion, the program does move forward, primarily because the leaders in the Indian Office and in Congress really care. The combination is at best an unstable one; it could be upset by anything from the results of another election to trouble in the silver bloc. But just now the official friends of the Indians are making hay, actively supported by "lay" organizations which continue to grow in power.

Within the administration there is an entirely new enforcement of the Indians' civil rights and religious liberty, a respect for their tradition and self-esteem. For the first time in history they have been consulted in the preparation of major legislation concerning them. While the standing budget has been materially reduced, the Indian Bureau has had the spending of millions of relief money, and has used the opportunity to make conservation work a means of training the tribes in doing for themselves what, if done at all, has always been done by the government. By this means, too, day-schools and hospitals have been built.

In the last session of Congress the passage of the Indian Reorganization Act was obtained (Wheeler-Howard Bill, Act of June 18, 1934), the most important general piece of Indian legislation since the Allotment Acts started the destruction of Indian property. This act ends the allotment system, protects remaining lands, gives tribes the positive right to organize and to have a voice in their own affairs, makes provision for recapturing a measure of lost lands for the landless, for improved education and for loan funds, which will give them a chance to help themselves. It completely reverses the philosophy of our Indian policy. If all other efforts fail, the passage of this single law will mark the present administration as a great one in Indian history.

Of course, there is a reaction. The plunderers, driven to cover by last year's drive, are out again, trying to make leaks in the law. In Oklahoma there is an element that lives largely upon that state's more than 100,000 Indians, and Oklahoma was specifically cut out of the Reorganization Act. Senator Thomas and Congressman Rogers of that state introduced into the late session an admirable bill to give those Indians the protection and advantages they desperately need. Over the Thomas-Rogers Bill, and attempts to cancel protections of the Reorganization Act, the issue is joined, as it will be year after year, so long as Indians have anything to lose and white men keep a special conscience for their dealings with other races.

OLIVER LA FARGE.

The Meadow Lark

Where the dust blows all the year
Eternal silence dulls the ear,
Eternal brightness seals the eye,
And nothing that can live or die
Moves in the desert save the rare
Illusion of the lark in air.

Oh empty soul forever stirred
With visions of a fiery bird—
Of lust that will not burn again,
Cast in the dry and bursting brain,
Bound by the will! until the scheme
Softens in eternal dream.

DON STANFORD.

The People's Front in France

THE PRESENT political situation in France is interesting and critical. Developments of the near future are likely to prove either most heartening to the enemies of fascism, or very discouraging indeed; it is unlikely that France will now pursue a middle course. In order to understand what is going on, it is necessary to go back to the attempted Fascist coup of February 6, 1934.

The White Commune.—The whole history of that attempted coup is yet to be written, and the whole story can never be told until we know the contents of the many documents still buried in the archives of the Paris police. There is no doubt, however, that the Fascists were seriously preparing to take control of the state. A Cabinet composed of reactionary members of the Paris Municipal Council would have been set up, and would have organized a "White Commune." The Paris press, on the whole, was sympathetic to the aims of the Fascist conspirators and sought, with some success, to give the world an entirely erroneous impression of what was going on. Popular indignation over the Stavisky affair was to be capitalized to set up a Fascist regime with seeming legality and the ironic slogan of "honesty and honor."

As all the world knows, this plan did not go through. In Paris, despite the general confusion, the working masses of the people refused to join the Fascists in their attack upon the French Parliament. In the provinces, the peasants also stood firm against the Fascist danger.

Insufficient attention has been given to the failure of the attempt to form a Third Centrist Party in France. This party, if it had been successful, would have combined autocratic methods of fascism with the phraseology of democracy. Its failure left the French political battleground sharply divided between the Left and the Right. This decision has made it possible to drive home to the masses of the French people an understanding that politics affects their own lives; that 200 wealthy families are now the real rulers of France, and that to belong to the "Left" means to wage effective warfare against this modern variety of feudalism. The Neo-Socialists, around whom the new Third Centrist Party was to have been created, are now in a process of disintegration. Many of their regional committees have joined the People's Front, the consolidation of the Socialists and Communists. Its leaders are divided. The Radical-Socialists, who also were to have been a powerful element in the new Centrist group, are divided too. As is so often the case nowadays, the rank and file are farther to the Left than are such leaders as Herriot and

Daladier, as is evidenced by the fact that many Radical-Socialists took part in the general strike which was the answer to the attempted Fascist *Putsch* of February 6.

The Present Political Alignment in France.—Today, therefore, France is clearly divided into a pro-Fascist Right and an anti-Fascist Left, represented by the People's Front. Moreover, as a result of the failure of the attempted coup of February 6, the French Fascists can no longer employ the slogan of socialism, as the Hitlerites did in Germany before they came to power. To complicate their difficulties, the most violent members of the Fascist group have largely lost the support of the financiers who formerly aided them, and are invaluable to parties such as theirs. The National Front includes the Royalists and the Jeunesses Patriotes, who are suspicious of each other and reluctant to cooperate for that reason. A separate group is the Croix de Feu, the largest, the best organized and the one with most money behind it. The chief of this group, Colonel de la Rocque, has shrewdly refused to put forward a program, and thus has avoided the antagonism that definite ideas always create. The members of this organization are former petty officers during the Great War, who today occupy humble positions as village grocers, department-store floorwalkers and the like. They are embittered and disillusioned, they trust Colonel de la Rocque implicitly, and while they are not numerous, they are of some importance, particularly because they are well armed with revolvers, machine guns, mortars and even airplanes. M. Laval, present head of the Cabinet, is often accused of being an accomplice of the Croix de Feu. On the July 14 of this year, he asked them to parade in order to offset the great demonstration by members of the People's Front. Their parade was also intended as a demonstration in favor of the deflationary decrees which were already foreshadowed, and were promulgated only three days later. Even within the Croix de Feu, however, there exists a Left wing. Several minor leaders have recently left Colonel de la Rocque, and it is reported that they intend to join the group of M. Bergery, the *enfant terrible* of the People's Front.

The People's Front.—To the average Frenchman, there has never been much reality in the division between Communists, Socialists and progressive radicals. The Communists themselves have been in the habit of voting, on the second ballot, for strong candidates of other Left parties. This fact helped to clear the ground for the creation of the People's Front, which was also aided concretely

by the active efforts of the Communist Party. They had long advocated a United Front, and the socialists finally accepted this by agreeing to the "pact for common action" on June 29, 1934. The program of the United Front included the defense of democratic liberties, the support of the immediate demands of the workers and peasants and common action to prevent the capitalists from forcing the working population of France to carry the chief burden of suffering produced by the economic crisis.

From that time on, the People's Front was organized throughout the country. Local committees were set up representing the two parties, numerous trade unions and various other associations. Thirty-eight associations of war veterans publicly acknowledged, during the demonstrations of November 11, that they intended to join. The intellectuals formed the Comité de Vigilance, which embraces many thousands of teachers and writers. Trade unions came into the movement, including former members of both moderate and revolutionary groups, prominent among them being large numbers of railway workers. The representatives of the People's Front in Parliament formed a special committee among their members, which, in case of a Fascist coup, could meet immediately and create a Committee of Public Safety.

July 14, 1935, was a day in Paris that will long be remembered by the partisans of the People's Front. On that day, from 400,000 to 500,000 persons gathered on the immense Place de la Bastille, on the very spot where the monarchy received its fatal blow in 1789. The significance of gathering in such a place, and of linking the historic revolutionary movement with the present struggle against special privilege, was not lost. It was a dramatic scene as two immense banners, the tri-colored flag of the Jacobins and the red flag of socialism, were unfurled above the heads and the clenched fists of the paraders. These two huge emblems, high as sails, moved slowly across the stirring mass of people, as they sang the second stanza of "La Marseillaise," with its attack upon tyranny. Meanwhile, at the other end of Paris, in the fashionable district of the Etoile and the Champs Elysées, the Croix de Feu were marching in military formation. In my judgment, there were less than 20,000 of them. (The numbers of both these crowds were variously estimated by the Paris press according to the political opinion of each newspaper.)

Weaknesses of the People's Front.—The People's Front, of course, has still many obstacles to overcome. Its first weakness comes from its heterogeneity, the diverse elements it has brought together. It is difficult to get an agreement between those who demand a program first of all and those who say that the program may wait until power has been achieved. In formulating the program itself, it is an almost impossible task to reconcile the opposing points of view. Some individuals want devaluation of the currency, and others do not.

Some demand extremely aggressive tactics, while others would remain on the defensive. Shall credit be nationalized? Shall the banks be nationalized or merely controlled? Should heavy industry be nationalized in its entirety or in part? What sort of taxation of capital, and how much, is desirable? On one point, however, all factions are agreed: the urgent necessity of defending, and expanding, to the utmost degree, the principles of democracy.

In France today the Fascists are armed and the anti-Fascists, true to their principles of legality, are not. The People's Front has demanded the disarmament of the Fascist forces, but thus far the Laval Cabinet, though it has made promises looking in that direction, has not fulfilled them. Fascism has made some inroads in the army, though there, as everywhere else, a struggle goes on between democrats and the supporters of autocracy. No one knows exactly what is the balance of forces, although on the situation in the army may rest the future of France.

A crisis may come this autumn, or it may come in May, 1936, when the general elections will be held. Internal developments, of course, will be influenced by what happens abroad. Since, however, the Fascist countries of Europe are the aggressive ones, it is unlikely that developments in Germany or Italy, for example, will do anything to aid French fascism. As a matter of fact, the anti-Fascist alliance has been strengthened materially by the Ethiopian crisis.

Future Possibilities.—It is impossible to say at present whether the Chamber of Deputies will or will not uphold Laval and his deflation decrees. If he is upheld, the crisis may be postponed until the election next year. It is possible, of course, that Colonel de la Rocque may attempt a coup before the election takes place. If Laval is overthrown, the Chamber may become alarmed and, with the connivance of certain Radical Socialists, another middle-of-the-road Cabinet like the present one may be formed. What seems more likely, however, is that the People's Front will then come into power. If it does, it must face the prospect of an immediate Fascist uprising. While it is impossible to predict the outcome in such a case, and particularly if the army were to intervene, the People's Front holds many strategic points. The Fascists would probably triumph in the center of Paris, but even there, they might be trapped within the Red Belt of working-class suburbs.

Another possibility, of course, is an incident similar to the Reichstag fire in Germany. It is known from reliable sources that the Croix de Feu has considered such a plan. The scheme was for a Fascist aviator to steal a private airplane of Pierre Cot, former Minister of Air and now a leader of the People's Front, and from it drop bombs on a Fascist meeting. The People's Front would then have been accused of this atrocious crime. *Agents*

provocateurs were undoubtedly active in the recent demonstrations in Brest and Toulon.

With such a serious future, it is obvious that the leaders of the People's Front need to be prudent and vigilant. France is now the country where the political lines are drawn more sharply than anywhere else. A Fascist triumph would mean the strengthening of reaction throughout the world, a new wave of White terror everywhere on the con-

tinent and, undoubtedly, an alliance of the Fascist countries for a war against Soviet Russia. On the other hand, a victory for the People's Front might prove a turning point in the history of fascism, beginning at that decline of which the first symptoms are already appearing. It would point the way for believers in democracy and liberty in all other countries.

Paris.

HENRI LEFEBVRE.

Back to Panhandling

THREE hundred thousand Americans are facing a dark future after the first of November. On that date, the federal government will close its transient relief centers throughout the country, the doors having already been locked against new applicants. Thereafter, the unemployed individuals heretofore cared for in this way will have to look for help in two quarters, neither very promising: W. P. A. jobs, or state and local charity.

As for the first, the W. P. A. is going forward so badly that its assistance is likely to be negligible for a long time to come; of 9,146 transients registered for jobs in New York City, for example, only 354 had been put to work up to a few days ago. As for the states and localities, it is doubtful whether they have the money; and even if they had, they are reluctant to care for transients and in many cases refuse to do so; city after city, state after state, gives no aid no matter how desperate your plight, unless you have lived a year, or two or three, within its borders. The fact that this problem is about to become so serious makes it pertinent to consider the whole question of the transient and what the government program for aiding him has been.

What is a transient? A bum, tramp, loafer, says the smug citizen who has not yet lost his job. The social worker says transients are chronic wanderers, some of them, but mainly persons or families uprooted by the depression, in search of work, and for the most part employable. The crash of 1929 sent fragments flying that have never come to rest.

The F.E.R.A. rules that federal transients are unattached persons or family groups who have not lived within the state in which they apply for relief for one year immediately preceding registration, and have no legal settlement in that state. State transients are those who have twelve months' residence or a legal settlement in the state, but not in the community of registration. The F.E.R.A. is now paying, and will pay until November 1, in full for the care of federal transients, and in varying degrees for state transients. In round numbers, some 300,000 persons have usually been under care in all the states but Vermont, which had no service.

What Transients Are Really Like.—Transients are a baffling proposition. More than most groups they defy analysis and treatment. Faced with a recorder, they tell what facts or fancies best suit the purpose of the moment. Confronted with a plan not to their liking, they check out, move on. A countrywide quarterly census yields some general data and in thirteen representative cities a closer study is continuously made in an effort to know the group. The average transient record is about as useful as a fairy tale for purposes of research or even information. Let us concede, however, that the special staff and care employed in the selected cities give validity to their data.

From this laboratory we learn that the transient group is predominantly white and native born (nine-tenths in each case). It is a young population: 85 percent under forty-five years, 42 percent under twenty-five, and 20 percent under twenty years. Some 60 percent are unattached individuals, and 40 percent are in families, usually made up of three members. Fourteen percent of family heads are women. Women and girls form 51 percent of persons in families, only 2 percent of the unattached, and 21 percent of all transients. Four-fifths of both unattached and heads of families report a usual occupation before migration, and only 10 to 15 percent of such work was in the casual or migratory-labor class. Nearly 70 percent say that migration began as a search for work.

What the Government Has Done.—The Transient Division of the F.E.R.A. gave State Relief Administrators a monthly grant earmarked for transients, and each state, with some federal guidance, has conducted a program supposed to involve food, shelter, clothing, work projects, recreation, education and vocational training. Needless to say, some localities never got beyond the first four items. Physical care is good, bad and indifferent, but in general far ahead of pre-government facilities.

"Treatment Centers" last June numbered 283 throughout the country, and transient camps 312. In cities the transient has been housed in the service's own congregate shelters, or lodged on contract in commercial rooming houses and hotels, in private

families, Salvation Army or mission shelters. Food is served in central mess halls or issued in grocery orders or orders on restaurants. Clothing furnished is suitable for work projects and not for interviewing prospective employers.

The nominal working week is usually from twenty-four to thirty hours. Some men do less, either from inclination or because work is scarce and ill planned. And plenty, on occasion, put in long hours of overtime to meet emergencies. There is a tendency among skilled artisans to give the wrong occupation on entering a camp. A plumber or electrician may call himself a painter or carpenter and be so assigned. The psychology back of it seems to be that he will not work at his own trade except for real wages. What this can do to a work project can be imagined. The aim of the service to conserve workers' skills also suffers from this practice.

Transients work for their keep, plus cash allowances of one to three dollars a week. To keep mess halls going, cooks must often be paid more: from \$5 to \$9. Transients work up into staff positions in some centers and are definitely barred in others. "Junior Staff" status, at \$20, \$30 or \$50 a month and maintenance, is the most common for those who get beyond cash allowances, but a few go on to real wages or salaries. The standards for determining when a particular job or man deserves staff rating have been vague, various and a source of discontent. Failure to give full recognition at pay equal to that of the non-transient staff amounts at times to exploitation.

Most centers have operated canteens, yielding revenue for athletic equipment, cards and table games. Movies, with a small admission charge, provide entertainment and more funds for recreation at some camps. Bands, glee clubs, amateur shows, libraries, camp or center newspapers, offer further diversion. Boxing, baseball and other teams compete with neighboring towns and have been one of the few links transients have had with communities.

On the score of medical care the transient is the Forgotten Man. The New Deal, which said no man shall starve, has seemed less sensitive to what disease may do to him. Accepting the transient as its charge, the government inconsistently says communities should hospitalize him at their expense. Few can or will. Yet emergency illness cases must go to hospitals and their bills be camouflaged to pass the auditor.

The service is understaffed with doctors, and they are underpaid. At the same time money is wasted in shipping transients with tuberculosis or venereal disease to camps that reject them and return them to city bureaus, where they may or may not be treated. The isolated position of camps, and epidemics such as spinal meningitis, have sometimes forced better medical set-ups. One or two states have T.B. camps. But medical care in general is so restricted that it becomes false economy. Claiming to do a job of rehabilitation, the service has had no positive health program.

What Was Wrong with the Program?—The program as a whole has lacked unity and direction. By its very nature it is a federal problem, but it has never had strong federal leadership. The unevenness of the system in itself promotes migrancy. Transients shop around, sampling facilities from coast to coast. Monthly turnover in transient centers ranges from 100 to 142 percent.¹ Some of this is due to deliberate touring. Much of it is aimless movement within the system and points to weakness in camp and city programs. They fail to hold men until there is purpose in moving. Some check-outs are real departures from the road and return to communities, perhaps to jobs. Turnover can also be explained in terms of continued job hunting.

Here the service dodged the issue. Far from providing placement counselors and liaison with public employment agencies, the personnel was cautioned against soliciting work for transients. This was based on fear of antagonizing localities toward the program. A few centers have had the sense to disregard the policy and do some effective placement work. The P.W.A. has never been open to transients, and residents are the first concern of the National Reemployment Service.² In the face of its own findings that transients are mainly former workers and stable elements in communities, the F.E.R.A. has allowed them to become a class apart. To some extent this was inevitable, since the mere act of caring for them as a group tended toward isolation and the solidifying of their transient status.

No discussion of transients can evade the question: Hasn't the service increased transiency? Yes and no. Without doubt the mere existence of facilities has drawn recruits who never would have faced the previous rigors of the road. And unquestionably the transient service has been taken by some as an invitation to tour the country. Low standards of home relief have sent some residents into transient ranks. On the other hand, a larger group than has ever been under the care of the service was on the road before the government stepped in. Adolescents now are out of the jungles, some have gone home and even stayed there, and the movement of others has been slowed down by sojourns in camps.

Now, all this is to be ended—unless, of course, the government changes its mind again as it has often done in the past. If the worst happens, for many thousands of persons it will be back to the road again; back to sleeping in parks, or under bridges. Back to the handout, the breadline, the hobo jungle. Brother, can you spare a dime? A nickel? A penny? Brother can I paw through the contents of your garbage pail? Petty thievery will increase; the jails will be filled to overflowing. If this is part of the bargain with big business to curtail government spending, if it is part of "back to normalcy," then it is a bargain for which a lot of people are going to pay dear.

J. O. READE.

Joe Louis Never Smiles

THESE people are here, 95,000 of them, because they have money. Down there on the field, men have paid \$150 and more for a pair of tickets. Twenty thousand seats were stamped "ringside," and the customers out beyond third base were bilked. They should have known that Mike Jacobs, who is running this fight, is a smart man. No one can do anything to him because he has the support of Hearst.

It feels good to have money again. Everyone in this crowd has money. The people who were swindled by Jacobs can afford it. Happy days are here again. Of course, things aren't so good, with twenty millions on relief. A man can be fired, and next morning there are ten men in line waiting for his job. But the unemployed have been around for a long time. No one can expect us to sit home and be sympathetic indefinitely.

It is a cold, clear night. The Stadium rises steeply around one-half of the field. The floodlights on its upper edge are directed on the field and the bleachers, and the Stadium itself is black except for a steady row of red exit signs. Almost the whole of the immense field is covered with chairs. Jacobs has pushed the customers so closely together that all that can be seen of them, under the floodlights, is their microscopic, bright faces. They form neat rows, divided into plots by the aisles, like commercial Dutch tulip beds. There are acres of them, shining pinkly. Men in white, with high cardboard signs in their caps, move gravely about selling pop, like gardeners. The ring is at second base, and the movie operators' metal cage, high on a pole, that you used to see at fights, is missing. The only movement comes from white tobacco smoke, rising in heavy waves. Through it you can see the American flags along the top of the Stadium, after the fashion of the opening verse of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Near at hand the crowd is a respectable, bridge-playing one. About a fifth are Negroes, more carefully dressed and more mannerly than the whites. The little drunk with the long, woolen muffler is certainly a Bronx dentist. He thinks correctly that the preliminary match now going on is poor, and keeps screaming, "Lousy." He brandishes a handful of crumpled bills, and will give odds to anyone. There seems to be something painful in his past that he would like to explain, but the woolen muffler keeps blowing in his face, and communication between him and us is eternally frustrated.

There is a stirring in the aisles near the ring. The people who amount to something, and who are bowed through the police lines outside the Stadium, are entering. There are five state Governors, the Republican National Committee, important busi-

ness figures and a large number of people whose press agents made them come so that their names would be in tomorrow's papers. Max Baer and his attendants are now at home plate. A dozen little pushing figures open up the crowd for him, and another dozen follow behind. Baer wears a white bathrobe, and has his hands on the shoulders of the state trooper in front of him. He nods to his many friends. Joe Louis, with another state trooper and other attendants, pushes in from third base. We learn afterwards that his bride, Marva Trotter, is in the first row in a bright green dress and orchids. Louis seems to see no one.

The floodlights are extinguished. Nothing exists except the brightly glowing ring. That is old Joe Humphries being lifted through the ropes, the man who announced fights before the depression. Since then he has been sick, and had a bad time. We have all been having a bad time, for that matter. Jack Dempsey squats in Baer's corner, but no one notices him. Humphries' assistant is bawling into the microphones: "Although Joe Louis is colored, he is a great fighter, in the class of Jack Johnson and the giants of the past." His voice fades away, and returns: "American sportsmanship, without regard to race, creed or color, is the talk of the world. Behave like gentlemen, whoever wins." Nearly two thousand police at the entrances of the Stadium are there to break up a possible race riot.

Baer has stripped. He has made a lot of money, Baer has. From all reports, he has spent a lot. He has played Broadway, Miami and the other hot spots. Why shouldn't he have done so? Joe Louis takes off his flashing silk bathrobe, blue with a vermilion lining. It is the only extravagant gesture he makes. For all his youth, he is thick under the jaws, thick around the waist. His face is earnest, thoughtful, unsmiling.

Max Baer hasn't been, I suppose, what you would call a good boy. Joe Louis has, though. This is his greatest advantage. He once was taken to a night club, and it is reported that within ten minutes he wanted to go home. He said he was sleepy. He is supposed to have saved his money. Louis' father died when he was only two years old, down in Alabama. Until she married again, his mother had a hard struggle to support the children, and they were very dear to her. Louis is fond of his mother. She is a Lily of the Valley at her church in Detroit, where the family now lives. The Lilies are having a supper, or some such event, in a few days. She wants him there, and he is going with his new wife.

We are too far away to hear the gong. They are out in the middle of the ring, with a stubby little man in a white sweater moving softly around them. Baer holds both hands, open, clumsily in front of

him. Look at Joe Louis. He is leading with a straight left arm, his right hand before his face ready to block, and his right elbow tucked in to his ribs. That is scientific. That is what they teach in correspondence courses, or the night gymnasium classes of the Y.M.C.A. In the first thirty seconds, you can tell that he reeks of study, practice, study. Any romantic white person who believes that the Negro possesses a distinctive quality ought to see Louis. He suggests a gorilla or a jungle lion about as much as would an assistant professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Baer stands flatfooted, with his great death-dealing right fist doubled by his side. He swings, and you can almost count three while the fist sails through the air. Louis moves sidewise and back, because he has been taught that if you move with a blow it can never hurt you. Baer's glove slides up the side of Louis' head harmlessly. He swings again and again, and, carefully and unhurriedly, Louis slips away. Look! Louis at last is going in. A left, a right and another left in close. Louis has pulled in his head, and, with both arms up before him, he looks like a brown crayfish. All you can see is the twitching of his shoulders. So incredibly fast he is that the blows themselves are almost invisible. His hands cannot possibly move more than a few inches. Look! Baer is backing into a neutral corner. Louis is raining down blows. Baer's nose spurts blood, his lower lip bleeds, his face is red pulp.

Baer must have meant something to many people. He made wisecracks and went to parties and was a harbinger of the return of the old days. He was Broadway, he was California and Florida, he represented the possession of money once more and spending it. This saddle-colored, dour-faced, tonguetied, studious youth, who is punishing Baer, punishing him more cruelly than human flesh and bones can endure, what does he represent? Baer stands with his hands hanging at his sides. He is helpless. He cannot hit the dissolving form before him, and he has never learned to protect himself. He holds his fine head, with its sweep of tightly curled hair and its great, brooding nose, high above his torturer. Pride alone keeps his head up, pride that has no tangible justification whatever. It was the same pride that kept Colonel Baratieri at Adowa, twenty years before Joe Louis was born.

It is the first round, and the fight is as good as over. Maybe it was foolish to spend money going to a fight. There must be many people, even down there in the ringside seats, who couldn't afford to spend what they did on tickets. No one can be sure of his job with twenty millions on relief. This is a crazy country, with people handing out a million dollars to Mike Jacobs and Hearst, while families right here in New York City are without enough to eat.

Round one is ended. Jack Dempsey vaults into the ring in a single, startling leap. Perhaps it is a trick. He must have vaulted from the ground to

the edge of the ring platform, and from there into the ring itself. But from a distance, it seems one motion, and it is beautiful. Beside the man that Dempsey was, Baer and Louis and Schmeling are phonies. Nowadays everything, including men, is somehow different.

The next three rounds are slaughter. In the second, Baer makes a wild, swinging, purposeless attack. For probably fifteen seconds, he appears formidable, but his attack has no substance inside it. With the third round, he is beaten, but Louis does not rush in, as Dempsey would have, to kill. Deliberately he circles Baer, with his earnest, thoughtful face, seeking an opening through which to strike without possible risk of injury. He takes no chance of a last, desperate fling of Baer's prodigious right hand. He is a planner. He is a person who studies the basic aspects of a problem and formulates a program. Apparently his studies are satisfactory, for he carefully steps up and knocks Baer down twice. Baer is on the canvas when time is called. Dempsey slides across the ring, picks Baer up like a mother, fusses over him until the fourth, and final, round. Baer once more is down. When the stubby referee, swinging his arm, reaches seven, he tries to rouse himself. This turns out later to have been a fortunate gesture. The customers who suspected the honesty of the fight, and were unconvinced that a man could be half-killed by fifty blows full on the jaw, were reassured as they watched Baer struggling to his feet. Had he been trying to throw the fight, they reasoned, he would have lain still. At the count of ten, Baer is on one knee, his swollen face wearing a comical expression of surprise.

The flood lights return us to time and space. Near at hand, there is remarkably little cheering, even from Negroes. They act as if, despite the police, they think it more prudent to restrain their feelings. There in the ring, placing his hand on Baer's shoulder in a stiff gesture, is the best fighter living, and the first Negro whose backers and trainer are men of his race. No white man shares in Louis' winnings. If the whites of the Boxing Commission will permit the match, he will be champion of the world.

All across the Stadium, the neat tulip beds are being broken up as tiny figures push into the aisles and toward the exits. A man with a small blonde mustache is sobbing: "Maxie, why didn't you hit him?" Downtown in the Forties and Fifties, re-decorated speakeasies will quickly be crammed to the doors and customers turned away. In Lenox Avenue in Harlem, Negroes will be tap-dancing from curb to curb, and singing: "The Baer goes over the mountain," and "Who won the fight?" Tomorrow the financial sections of the newspapers will report that business leaders regard the fight as final proof that the country's economic worries are past, and a comfortable and prosperous future is assured.

JONATHAN MITCHELL.

The Movies Join Hearst

THE March of Time," in its fifth newsreel edition, suddenly went off in a strange and ominous direction, smacking strongly of fascist propaganda. Earlier issues had been on the whole fairly unbiased, although in the third there was a section glorifying a Mexican mob shown (in posed, fictional scenes) hanging a socialistic school teacher who was supposed to have suggested to little children that there was no God. This was balanced, however, by fairly accurate reporting in the sequences on Hitler, Huey Long and Soviet Russia.

But the fifth issue, which has been widely distributed by RKO, was far from impartial. The American army maneuvers, introduced as showing what would happen in the event of America's being invaded, are described so realistically in the simple future tense that one feels as if the Reds or the du Ponts, depending on one's point of view, were peeking around the screen; the life of Father Coughlin, who is undisputed as potential fascist number one since the effacement of Huey Long, is presented impressively, with his superior bishop saying "What the Holy Father teaches, Father Coughlin preaches"; and the French fascist leader, François de la Rocque, is portrayed with an enthusiasm approximating reverence. In the latter sequence, Socialists and Communists are shown running about the streets like scared dogs; no mention is made of the powerful People's Front, which has checked the development of fascism in France. De la Rocque, who apes both Hitler and Mussolini in some respects, is shown exhorting his Croix de Feu followers to "Be ready! Our hour is at hand!" The only offset came when the announcer mentioned the "breath-taking" fact that the fascists are known to be financed by the munitions manufacturers.

In the sixth issue, now current, "The March of Time" was toned down slightly. Fair sequences on the coal bootleggers of Pennsylvania and on Ethiopia were balanced, however, by a sequence on the Civilian Conservation Corps, in which methods of getting rid of the "troublemakers" who objected to working for five dollars a month were played up as a means of making the ranks safe for Americanism.

We may laugh at Victor McLaglen's Light Horse Cavalry, "Colonel" Arthur Guy Empey's gaudy Hollywood Hussars and George Brent's California Esquadrielle, although they are dangerous indications of which side Hollywood's money is on. But not to be taken lightly are the effects of such films as "The March of Time" on the minds of the millions who attend motion pictures every week.

The newsreel is without doubt the most effective type of film for propagandizing. Newsreels are billed on practically every theatre program, and are seen by many more people than the average feature film. Short shots of newsreel type were used by General Johnson in trying to put over the N.R.A. Fake "news" shots were used effectively in California last year in the campaign against Upton Sinclair. Vagrants in obvious make-up swarmed from boxcars, and disreputable-looking persons with foreign accents bespoke their support of the Epic Plan. More recently, the newsreels were recruited in a weak attempt to stimulate renovating and rebuilding by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

To determine the contents of the average run of newsreels, a survey of the five standard brands was undertaken from April to June, 1935. Carefully instructed college students of sociology tabulated and described briefly the contents of forty-five different issues of news films. The results hardly bear out the contention of the movie magnates that the cinema is a great educational force. In fact, only 3.6 percent of all items could be classed as primarily educational, and these included such doubtful items as the San Diego Exposition and the return of Admiral Byrd from the Antarctic. Following is a brief recapitulation of the 307 items:

CONTENTS OF 45 NEWSREELS

<i>Classification</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Sports	24.8
Human Interest	23.1
Militarism	10.4
Disasters	8.2
Imperialism, fascism	5.9
The New Deal	5.9
Other politics	5.5
Aviation	3.9
Educational	3.6
Anti-militarism	3.3
Charity	3
Crime	1.6
Religion	1

Militaristic scenes make up 10.4 percent of all items shown. In forty-five newsreels there were thirty-two shots of such fascinating subjects as military reviews, naval maneuvers and bombing planes. Twelve more shots of civil aviation contain military implications. By way of contrast, there were only ten shots, 3.3 percent of all, that could be construed as pacifistic in effect. Two of these were of the wife of America's ace draft-dodger pleading for her husband; four were of European diplomats expressing pious hopes for peace. Fox Movietone

News ranked highest in militarism, with 13.3 percent of all items in this class. Hearst Metrotone News was second with 10.6 percent; Universal had 10.5 percent, Paramount 9.4 percent, and Pathé 7 percent. These latter figures are based on only a few films, but the large total number of militaristic shots is significant.

A trend toward militarism and reaction is to be discerned also in the feature films. Hollywood has sent us in the past year such militaristic ballyhoo as the Warner Brothers-First National pictures "Here Comes the Navy," "Flirtation Walk" and "Devil Dogs of the Air." Paramount's current release, "Annapolis Farewell," so glorifies the navy that callow youths just out of high school are expected to flock to the recruiting station, and facilities are being set up to take care of them. As Carl Dreher has suggested, the few hundred million dollars' worth of props furnished free for such pictures at least partially explain the producers' predilection toward militarism; but is that the whole story?

While I have sometimes suspected that the comrades of the left see plots where none exist, the theory that the movies are starting a drive toward fascism seems to be borne out in many recent pictures. British imperialism was thoroughly purified and glorified by "Lives of a Bengal Lancer," and by "Clive of India" and "Sanders of the River," in which the noble Englishman altruistically takes over the burden of governing the inferior races. Fully equal to these was that eulogy of American imperialism, "Oil for the Lamps of China," which was revised by Hearst to prove that corporations have souls.

On the labor scene the evidence is even more convincing. "Black Fury," billed as a daring pro-labor sensation and recommended by conservative labor officials in several places, actually lands a treacherous blow below labor's belt. As against a few realistic shots of the coal-and-iron police, the picture depicts a strike resulting from the agitation of strikebreakers' agents; a union rank and file that is stupid and easily misled, while the old-line officials are sacrificing their all to the cause; and the winning of the strike by one man who, inspired by the return of the girl he loves, finds the dynamite shack entirely unguarded and brings the owners to time by threatening to blow up the mine. Such a strike could be found only in Hollywood.

Red-baiting rises to a new climax with the Columbia picture "Call to Arms," now being released under the title "Together We Live." The horrible Reds are shown as insidious worms who plan to bomb industry and cause general chaos. It is left to the Civil War veterans to raid the radical meeting places and march the filthy creatures to the old men's home to await the federal authorities. Flag-waving and "good sound principles" are thrown in to provide unusual entertainment, according to one reviewer. Even more dangerous is

"Red Salute" (commented on editorially in last week's New Republic), which undertakes to prove, as did H. Bedford-Jones in his famous *Liberty* article, that the colleges are hotbeds of Communist propaganda that undermine the ideals and morals of American womanhood.

The film industry is once again marshalling its resources to combat the forces it hates and fears, as it did in the war days, when "The Kaiser, the Beast of Berlin" helped to arouse America's thirst for gore. If the movies continue to coöperate in the militaristic, Red-baiting campaign of the Hearst and Macfadden press, we may expect the more frequent recurrence of fascist outrages such as the San Francisco Red raids and the more recent Santa Rosa affair.

There exist at least two ways of combating fascism and militarism on the screen. The first is to protest such films as "Call to Arms" and "Red Salute," and "The March of Time" and Hearst Metrotone News, with an organized campaign of letters and 'phone calls to impress the theatre managers. Several college towns last spring established boycotts against the Hearst newsreel, and more will follow suit this fall. Picketing of theatres showing such propagandist films is effective, and has already been successfully used in New York City.

A second method, which has been suggested by Richard S. Ames, is to demand a congressional investigation of the film industry, similar to the munitions investigation. Federal regulation might in the long run be no more desirable than Hearst-Wall Street regulation. But an investigation would at least make the film fan slightly more conscious of the forces that determine his visual diet.

SELDEN C. MENEFFEE.

Cold History

Man is weak
and short of span;
he must wreak
what death he can
to rid his gall
on green blade
or animal.
Renegade
with all his heart,
he takes killing
for his art;
and "God willing,"
says he, "I'll get
"the fish of man
"into my net";
and "God willing,"
says he, "I'll try
"the flesh of man
"before I die."

VINCENT McHUGH.

Washington Notes

*Britain Steals the Brain-Trusters' Stuff—No
Chance for Trade Agreements Now—
Thumbs Down on Boon-Doggling*

THE TERM "Brain-Truster" has become one of reproach, like "prohibition agent" under Hoover, but Brain-Trusters still exist here, and are watching the European war crisis with anxious pessimism. They say that the original foreign policy of the New Deal could have prevented it, if anything could. Particularly towards England, they have the bitter, wistful attitude of a girl, jilted by a boy friend, who now sees him rolling in the gutter.

The New Deal foreign policy was still-born. But it is worth recalling for two reasons. It will be revived again if ever there is a chance of its success, and it also constitutes the minimum agenda for the world conference that must eventually be held if the present European regime is to save itself. Briefly stated, the New Deal policy called for the international control of raw materials and the creation of consumer markets. The first half of the program came nearest to realization at the London wheat conference of 1933. In practice, the London agreement turned out to be as full of holes as Swiss cheese, and was repudiated by Argentina a year later. But for a few dizzy moments, the American delegates thought they saw victory.

The Brain-Trusters' plan provided for crop limitation after the fashion of the A.A.A. in each wheat-producing country. Overhanging, demoralizing surpluses would be permanently ended. In each country, replicas of Secretary Wallace's "ever-normal granary" would be instituted, and shortages equally done away with. The quantity of wheat coming on the market each year, which would, within narrow limits, determine the price, would be regulated by treaty among the principal nations. An attempt actually to do this was made in connection with the London agreement.

Spurred on by the American cotton surplus, the Brain-Trusters made immense and little-known efforts to obtain a cotton agreement based on similar mechanisms. They came to nothing. The Brain-Trusters' complete plan called for agreements covering all major raw-material exports. In angry reminiscence, the Brain-Trusters point out that these agreements would have been fundamentally different from the international restriction schemes of the past—the Stevenson rubber agreement, the Chadbourne sugar plan and the present tottering tin pool in London. These have been private ventures, strictly for profit. Their object has been to rob importing countries. The end of the Brain-Trusters' plan was to place those nations without home territories or colonies to provide raw materials on a plane of approximate equality with the "sated" countries.

Importing nations must sell abroad to pay for their raw materials, and the second half of the Brain-Trusters' program provided for progressive, horizontal cuts in world tariffs. They were not naïve enough to suppose that tariff cuts would be easy to bring about in the United States. But if, in return, we could obtain a series of international agreements that would guarantee to our cotton, hogs, oil

and many other raw-material exports a permanent market abroad, and in addition would bolster up world peace, tariff reductions might have been possible. At least the administration would have had a vivid campaign issue.

Some such plan as the Brain-Trusters' is implied in Sir Samuel Hoare's speech at Geneva, when he called for a "redistribution" of raw materials. It is this speech that has enraged and saddened the Brain-Trusters. Jealously, they point out that their international "Share-Our-Wealth" program was put forward when it had at least a chance of adoption, not when Italian troopships were flocking through Suez. Two years ago, the planned international control of raw materials might have slowed down Hitler's drive towards eastern Europe, might have eased Japan's pressure on Outer Mongolia and northern China, even if it could not have saved Manchuria. But during 1933-34, British diplomats were uninterested in the Brain-Trusters' ideas. When they pleaded that in no other way could a world crisis and eventual war be avoided, the British were courteously skeptical. "They have made their crisis, they and the moss-covered French Quai d'Orsay," say the Brain-Trusters, "now let them lie in it."

The reader is warned, however, that this is not the view of the higher State Department officials. They do not feel that the situation of Europe is basically hopeless. It is my impression, at least, that they have converted themselves to the belief that the present crisis is entirely due to the unaccountable, personal wickedness of Mussolini. The luxuriant flattery that has come from London as a result of the American pronouncements recalling the Kellogg-Briand Pact has delighted Mr. Hull. The charge that he is transforming this country into a sort of ladies' auxiliary to British imperialism in its contest with Italo-French imperialism—against the clear intent of Congress that we should stay out of all European controversies—would be rejected by him with scorn. He is an aged, valorous knight, riding forth to rescue the maiden Peace, and the accusation that she is now the gun-moll of one of Europe's rival gangs would be regarded by him as malicious gossip.

The administration seems genuinely alarmed by the difficulties of the work-relief program. There was a time, early in the depression, when a defense of boon-doggling might have been made. Much of the criticism of the C.W.A., in my opinion, was undeserved. But no defense can be offered now, and the administration is beginning to realize it. Although Secretary Ickes has lost in his struggle to obtain funds for the P.W.A., he has won a moral victory by destroying the administration's faith in Hopkins' "light public works."

There is some evidence that Hopkins is quietly dropping as many boon-doggling projects as possible, and that this change of policy is partly responsible for the delay in putting the unemployed to work. The administration has also entered the general defense that the W.P.A. program is only temporary, and will soon be replaced by solid, worth-while public construction. Meanwhile, the Republicans are busily filing away Mr. Ickes' criticisms of the W.P.A. For the first time since 1933, they are beginning to think well of him.

Washington,

T. R. B.

Other People's Money

*Hail and Farewell to Mr. Kennedy—Mr.
Landis Now Lifts the Scalpel—
Beware of Riding a Boom*

WHEN Joseph P. Kennedy was named by President Roosevelt as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission and, in effect, was made its chairman, I expressed in this department a sharp criticism of the appointment. I believed then, as I believe now, that no man should be named to such regulatory commissions from among the groups that are to be regulated. And in the case of Mr. Kennedy, I ventured some criticisms of his record in business which, I thought, made his appointment unwise. Now Mr. Kennedy has resigned as chairman of the Commission. And I think it is but fair to him to say that he disappointed the expectations of his critics. He was, I firmly believe, the most useful member of the Commission.

However, it is not fair to the important objective of the Commission and the Exchange Act to make it appear that the great task of taming Wall Street has been accomplished and that, as so many newspaper articles implied, the chief work of the Commission must now be the enforcement of the new utilities act.

It is true that Mr. Kennedy did set in motion the various explorations essential to the effective restraining of Wall Street within the bounds of honesty and harmlessness. But few of these studies have been completed and, of course, little final action has been taken as yet upon the gravest problems the Commission faces.

The effectiveness of the Commission to restrain pool operations is as yet untested, since that vicious form of brigandage has not offered the rich pickings that flourished in the days before the act was passed. The whole subject of short selling remains to be dealt with. Certain tentative and quite mild regulations have been issued, but they hardly touch the real problem. The subject of broker functions is now being studied, and so far nothing has been done on the subject. The place of the specialist has been only mildly considered. No permanent policy has been settled on. The subject of reports by corporations has been acted on, but grave criticism has been expressed in regard to the inadequacy of the Commission's requirements. The over-the-counter markets are being studied; hence it is not true to say that this problem has been dealt with. A fine study of reorganization is in progress, from which great good should come, but the Commission has not yet acted on this study. It is no criticism of Mr. Kennedy or the Commission that no action has yet been taken. The time to take such action will come when the studies are completed. Indeed, I allude to these things reluctantly, since I do not wish to dilute my own testimonial of good service to the retired chairman, save that I think it of the first importance that the impression ought not to be created that the work of the Commission has been done and that henceforward it is but necessary to enforce the policies determined on. The fact is that the work of the Commission has only begun.

And now Commissioner James M. Landis has succeeded to Mr. Kennedy's post. I, for one, read with some misgivings an editorial in The New York Herald Tribune praising the appointment of Mr. Landis and saying, among other things, "Wall Street undoubtedly will be the first to applaud yesterday's announcement that Mr. Landis is to be the new head of the Securities and Exchange Commission."

If men are known by the enemies they make, they must expect also to be judged by the section of the audience from which the applause comes. I do not believe it is necessary to earn the hatred of the men you are called on to regulate. That sort of job may be done with a show of amiability and gentleness. But those of us who have watched the long and disillusioning episodes of regulation have learned to hear with well founded dismay the plaudits of the utilities for the state regulatory commissions. The operation to be performed on Wall Street is a glandular one of a very melancholy character. One may well look with mild surprise at the patient still on the table clapping his hands with glee for a surgeon who is about to sterilize him. He must believe that the good doctor will falter and decide, in the end, to permit him to retain his magnificent potency.

This is an age of grim realities. If the management is to be effective, it must be managed by men who are willing to choose boldly from which side they wish their applause to come. Those who are eager to hear ringing cheers from the partisans of every side will end amid groans. It is as certain as sunrise that any regulation that pleases Wall Street will be a total failure. I believe I may say that no one wishes Commissioner Landis a fuller measure of success than I do. I hope, therefore, that he may be spared the humiliation of having regulated Wall Street to its entire satisfaction.

It becomes apparent that there is gold in these h'yar hills. The world was a little startled at the open-handed extravagance of the crowd that descended on New York for the Baer-Louis fight. Like those merry mobs of spenders headed by the famous six hundred millionaires of Mr. Tex Rickard, who flung around their loose dollars under Mr. Coolidge, this throng blew in, we are informed, no less than \$12,000,000 to make a Harlem holiday. But it should not have been surprising to anyone who has watched the moving picture of the times these last twelve months. Government money has been going out each month in increasing volume. This has been going on for two full years. Inevitably, sooner or later, this money, moving about from hand to till and from till to palm, has been creating a reservoir of purchasing power that must sooner or later make itself felt. We are in the first stages, not of anything resembling recovery, but of a mild inflationary movement, thoroughly unsound and inevitably doomed to its own collapse. I do not see the signs of its collapse at an early date. It may make a fine opportunity for the professional speculator. But in the end it will do no one any good. On the contrary, it may prove a grievous disaster and will, perhaps, injure no one more than the man who so blithely manages its uncharted drift.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

On the Labor Front

*Prospects for a Lively Convention—A
Setback for Dr. Lefkowitz—Labor
News from All Over*

THERE are many indications that the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, which opens in Atlantic City next week, will be one of the liveliest, touch-and-go affairs in the Federation's fifty-five years. It may also be one of the most significant. Progressive trade unionists, demanding more militant action by the A.F. of L., will have the largest bloc of delegates present in more than two decades. They are likely to make it difficult for the official leadership to bury in committee, or otherwise ignore, such controversial questions as industrial unions, the formation of a Labor Party, compulsory unemployment insurance as provided in the Lundeen Bill, and so on.

It is no secret that the workers in the mass-production industries—steel, rubber, rayon, automobiles—have been sadly disappointed by the Federation's vacillating policy toward industrial unions. Last year's convention straddled the issue by approving industrial unions so long as they did not encroach upon the jurisdiction of existing craft unions. This restriction, obviously, sets up serious barriers to organizational activity, and the delegates from the mass-production industries will undoubtedly make a united fight against it.

Closely connected with this will be the fight against the paternalistic control that the Federation has tried to exercise over the recently organized workers in these fields. The newly formed International in the automobile industry was forced to accept officers appointed by President Green, even though by ballot it had rejected Mr. Green's candidates. Similarly, President Green attempted, two weeks ago, to appoint the president of the newly formed United Rubber Workers of America. When, however, the rubber workers rejected this proposal by a vote of forty-four to nine, they were permitted to elect their own officials. President Green's candidate, it is significant to note, did not receive a single vote in the final election for president. The paternalism of which these two cases are merely examples is held largely responsible for the failure of the A.F. of L. to make greater headway among the unorganized workers.

The Labor Party idea seems to be spreading, despite the efforts of the more conservative A.F. of L. leaders to discourage it. The latest recruit is the Utah State Federation of Labor, which voted at its recent convention for a Labor Party "based on trade and industrial unions, farmers' unions and all progressive elements who feel that a complete breakaway from capitalism is necessary." The Oregon and Wisconsin State Federations are similarly on record, while in several states the proposal was defeated only by a small margin. The demand for formation of a Labor Party, according to estimates made by its proponents, now has the support of at least one million members of the A.F. of L.

Another important trend, which the convention will face, is the growing unity among workers. This is best illustrated, perhaps, by the crushing defeat suffered by Dr. Abraham Lefkowitz in his attempt to drive alleged Communists out of the Teachers' Union in New York City. Dr. Lefkowitz attempted to get the annual convention of the American Federation of Teachers to revoke the charter of the New York local and, when the convention refused to act, resigned his office, charging that the union was controlled by Communists. His action has since been condemned, not merely by liberal and progressive labor leaders, but also by John J. Munholland, vice-president of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York. In Mr. Munholland's words, the walkout staged by Dr. Lefkowitz was "an attempt at union wrecking." The Central Trades and Labor Council, it should be noted, is both the highest body of organized labor in New York City and the most conservative. The defeat of Dr. Lefkowitz, accordingly, may have considerable bearing on the efforts that will undoubtedly be made at the convention by President Green and others to start a mass expulsion drive against militant union members under the guise of a Communist purge.

Labor Briefs.—In England the threat of war has impelled the Boot and Shoe Union to call a halt on all work now being done in factories under its jurisdiction on equipment for Italy. The stoppage will interrupt work on several hundred thousand pairs of army boots, ordered by Italy, on which the shops have been working twenty-four-hour shifts. . . . Though no American union has thus far stopped work on war orders, organized labor in Philadelphia took a significant step last week in holding a trade-union conference against war. "If neutrality means restriction on the production of war goods by the government," declared the chairman, "we will support that move." The conference had the support of virtually every A.F. of L. official in the city and included delegates from plants producing munitions and war supplies. . . . From Connecticut, where many factories are reported to be working night and day as a result of orders stimulated by war demands, the Manufacturers' Association reports "an alarming shortage" of skilled labor. Since the industries there are still some 30 percent below normal, one wonders whether the shortage may not be confined to *non-union* skilled labor. The A.F. of L. has investigated frequent reports of similar shortages (especially when industries were trying to claim exemption from N.R.A. restrictions on "learners") and usually it found that skilled *union* labor was plentiful. At present, union labor in the skilled trades is about 20 percent unemployed, according to the A.F. of L. . . . In Minneapolis, where two bystanders were killed and many injured in the strike at the Flour City Ornamental Iron Works, the strike has finally been settled with substantial wage increases granted to the Machinists' Union. In the strike at the Strutwear Hosiery Mills in the same city, Governor Floyd B. Olson has announced that he will not permit the firm to reopen until it has met with representatives of its employees and bargained collectively.

WILLIAM P. MANGOLD.

C O R R E S P O N D E N C E

War, Religion and the Soviets

SIR: The remark of a local minister during the course of a militantly evangelistic sermon, that "Russia, that godless nation, stands today as a menace to the entire civilized world," made me realize that there is an entire possibility that in the event of another world war we would march to the already conditioned slogan and tune of "Onward, Christian Soldiers." This is a possibility that, I believe, is too frequently minimized by those who are laboring to guarantee our continued peacefulness. It is too frequently assumed that the Church is losing its grip because dwellers in large cities are neglecting their church attendance. The power of the clergy, however, to provide the necessary emotional or "noble cause" stimulus in a forthcoming war as in the last one, should not be too lightly regarded.

Christians, of course, fail to realize that the revulsion of Russians against the Greek Catholic Church (and hence Christianity) is entirely natural in view of the very un-Christian system it actively sanctioned, and that religion is, especially to them, all too obviously used as the "opiate of the people." Christians also fail to realize, of course, that Christ's teachings are definitely communistic. (Even the violence advocated by many Communists is not wholly unsanctioned, as witness: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword." "For I am come to set a man at variance against his father . . . and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." "He that loveth father and mother more than me is not worthy of me. . . .") Nor do they realize that Paul's teachings, equally venerated by Christians, are in some cases even more specifically so, although he has become the patron saint of the status quo. ("The husbandman that laboreth must be the first partaker of the fruits.") . . .

Now it is lamentably true that those who espouse the Russian cause and the cause of social betterment throughout the world scorn to show any consideration for the pieties and prejudices of Christians. They also, therefore, scorn to use the persuasive hypocrisy of an appeal to the Christian sentiments, forgetting that although Christians pay such scant attention to the practice of Christian precepts, they are quick to go into a state of shock at any utterances that violate their pieties. . . .

If Christian support is to be gained for social reform and for attempts to assure neutrality in approaching wars, it would be well to remember that the old saw about more flies being caught by honey than by vinegar "didn't get where it is for nothing." An article ["The Propaganda Balance Sheet," *The New Republic*, August 14] raised the issue of the emotional appeals against neutrality; we must not, it seems to me, underestimate the power of "Onward, Christian Soldiers."

Quincy, Fla.

AUSTIN W. MORRILL, JR.

"Intellectuals, Unite! You Have Nothing to Lose But Your Brains"

SIR: . . . A small group of us in Baltimore have begun to take stock of ourselves. Where does the intellectual belong? We bring to the scene a somewhat new answer and a new leadership.

You see, we have come to the conclusion that the individual who lives in the enjoyment of thought *per se* and the arts is, in his habits, completely different from the man-in-the-street—goaded solely by the whims of his body and the temptings of glory. The Mentarian (as we call him) must be regarded as an animal quite apart from man. The typical Mentarian—Voltaire or Samuel Butler or Shaw—is as far a reach from the typical man—Calvin Coolidge or Huey Long—as that man is from the typical dog. . . .

The Mentarian is a non-conformist—forever to be misunderstood and hated by the conformists—useful to society for his inventions or as an intellectual clown, but almost never as a leader.

Of late years, a curious thing has happened. Some natural Men-

tarians, suddenly seeing a large mass of the people in bondage, set about to liberate them—not doubting for a moment that they were fit for the job. Now, as a matter of history, it seems that great mass movements have been nothing more than the wholesale violence of groups—themselves suffering violence. But, into such a picture, where does your intellectual fit? Certainly he, in his attempt to mentarianize the world, can't share the frenzy of the mob. On the contrary, it's probable that the intellectuals are not only useless in helping the downtrodden, but have considerably hindered their political expression by bombast and the gulf of antagonism between Mentarian and man!

Now we, in Baltimore, have come to the conclusion that we should return the class struggle back to the dullards. For ourselves, since our attitudes under any society are anti-human, let us organize our great potential forces. Our brothers of the physical sciences, by their by-products, could give us great financial power—enough possibly to ward off the menace of fascism and to assure our independence of expression. . . .

Already a beginning has been made. At the Johns Hopkins University, there is an enthusiastic group in support. Many graduate students have joined to form a Mentarian Society. It is thus we bring before the public this new leadership. Mentarians, unite! Baltimore, Md. EDGAR KEMLER.

Extracts from Letters

SYSTEMATIC terrorism waged against leaders of the working class, students and liberals continues unabated in Cuba, according to a report sent us by Miss Anita Brenner, chairman of the committee on Cuba of the Non-Partisan Labor Defense. Miss Brenner quotes from a letter sent by the Cuban National Committee Pro-Amnesty for Political and Social Prisoners, telling of beatings, prolonged and savage torture and murder of victims arrested and tried on the flimsiest pretexts by agents of the Mendieta government. "After the strike last March," the letter says, "the entire police system was mobilized for the persecution of workers' parties and trade unions. Not a single headquarters was left open. Every labor party and union was outlawed. Emergency tribunals functioned to turn arbitrary arrests into long jail sentences. Thousands of workers, students and intellectuals, given these sketchy trials, were condemned to monstrous terms." In view of the coming elections, the Mendieta government is now making vague promises of amnesty, but no real amnesty is expected by anyone familiar with the methods and personnel of the present government. Cuban workers appeal to friends and sympathizers in the United States to help out with letters, telegrams and contributions, if possible. Contributions may be sent to the Non-Partisan Labor Defense, 22 East Seventeenth Street, New York City.

The repertory department of the New Theatre League announces the formation of the Social Drama Book Service to supply plays other than those published by the League. There are now 300 acting groups affiliated with the New Theatre League and the new service will make available to them, and to other interested parties, books and manuscripts of all publishers dealing with the theatre, the dance and motion pictures. The Social Drama Book Service has its headquarters at the New Theatre League, 114 West Fourteenth Street, New York City.

Miss Irene Merrill, editor of *The Windsor Quarterly* of Mena, Arkansas, and Mr. Richard Wright, of Chicago, Illinois, protest against Otis Ferguson's recent review of "Men in Boots" by Nelson Algren. Miss Merrill accuses Mr. Ferguson of devotion to an impossible, Aristotelian classicism, and asks whether he is unaware of the revolution in writing of the last two centuries. Both correspondents strenuously disagree with Mr. Ferguson's comparison of "Men in Boots" with Edward Anderson's "Hungry Men," to the disadvantage of the former.

Soft Speech

If This Be Treason, by the Reverend John Haynes Holmes and Reginald Lawrence. The Music Box, September 23, 1935.

IT IS obvious, of course, that if you convert the trivial to an idea, you merely convert the idea to triviality. And yet even that may have its uses. I have no doubt, for example, that such a book as "Pollyanna" did persuade some persons to look on the bright side of things and love it; though it may or may not be true that their grateful gladness does much to help matters in general—a large question, not to be answered off-hand. In the same way, it is doubtless true that the cause of pacifism—for those of us who believe in pacifism—may be served even by so soft, melodramatic and stepped-up an affair as the Theatre Guild's presentation and Dr. John Haynes Holmes' and Mr. Reginald Lawrence's drama at the Music Box. At any rate, when quiet returns after the last curtain, no small number of the audience may have responded to the play's thesis. It may very well be that good esthetics—which is, also, always good biology—would tell us that bad art ultimately is bound to serve life badly. I believe such to be true; but, remembering some of the audience at this Guild production, I am inclined to ask myself if it is not possible to flatter life for the moment by taking it so seriously. This means that in mediocre persons life is mediocre, and so may be served by mediocre art.

There seems to be very little to say for "If This Be Treason," but there are various things to say about it.

The story of this drama of pacifism concerns a President of the United States who comes into office at a moment when the United States fleet has been sent secretly to the Pacific, Japan has seized Manila, et cetera—the et cetera at such times is very extensive. The new President wishes to persuade Japan to peace. Resistance of the Senators and Congressmen, threats of impeachment and various dynamic motifs, send him off finally to Japan—Congressmen, Senators and what not are left at home writhing and asserting their rights. The Japanese Premier is domineering, he will have the President of the United States arrested then and there. The British Ambassador tries to intervene. In vain. But word comes that Congress, back there in America, has voted to delay impeachment until peace is declared; and, with that, we hear pacifistic noises in the street. And so you see East, West, the cuckoo's nest and everywhere are going to have peace. The lady secretary of the President looks quite theatrical about it, though wry and reserved, for such is stage modernity.

Among the notations it can be said:

Nothing has proved better than this present production does that the Theatre Guild has done very little for acting in the American theatre. The Guild has retained some fair players and has employed—at times borrowed or picked up from other groups—some good actors, using them sometimes much more than once. But this has been largely hit and miss, hand to mouth, production to production. And now that the Theatre Guild comes to a play, which, however tricked up as to stage intervals and fatuous as to simplification, could yet bear some genuinely good acting, it has only an easy assemblage of players, some repeatedly,

some not, but all mildly, known to the audience. What we get is a technical snap here and there, as in stage melodrama, an amiable exhibitionism—as with amateurs—and, also, a kind of public exhibitionism.

There is a distinct sort of acting needed for a play like "If This Be Treason," dealing with a President of the United States, the Premier of Japan and such, and involved with huge cloudy symbols of significant thought. It is an acting that must eschew tricks. Even an overclever make-up may do the wrong thing by the role and by the play. Heave, roar, press lips, vibrate, rectify the world by your concerted attack, and very little may happen. The process is rather from within, a concentration almost destroying to the artist, a vast technical humility, and an acknowledgment of the cost of life that goes with all creation.

The better the stage devices were in "If This Be Treason," the worse they served the play's depth. By reminding you of expert stage stuff, they destroyed your faith in the play's content. The dramatic moment went over the footlights with such a bang that nothing was left on the stage.

This vulgar stage result—so active and propulsive—will be stirring to some spectators, for the mere reason that everything falls in their laps.

Granting the worthiness of the theme—swallowed whole—granting a noble thematic merit, a play like "If This Be Treason" is all wrong esthetically, or, if you like, as technique, or, if you like, as art. It is wrong not for the ideas and motifs comprised in it. The trouble is not this, for great drama manifests plenty of ideas. The trouble, in this regard, is that the play is too explicit. Too explicit is a phrase forever hard to elucidate. In a play, to be too explicit means that, as the speeches and scenes proceed, you are in a constant state of completeness. All is understood, all is said. What needs a full image in living terms has merely been worded into a deceiving wholeness. Art if genuinely created is never explicit; it is alive, with all the eternal, vital uncertainty implied. In creative art those who say all usually have created nothing. Their product may seem to some to be intellectual. As a matter of fact, it does reside in their heads, because nothing has, as art, been brought into existence. What difference does it make whether or not a thing seems to express much, so long as it does not exist and can, therefore, express nothing?

The extent to which a work of art exists measures the extent to which it expresses anything, however important the thing to be expressed may be. It is a curious fact that the explicit statement of the content will never afford us the content but only the statement. To convey all the points is a matter of contrivance, expressive talk and skill. To convey the content is a matter of imagination. The images and the effective moments and speeches in "If This Be Treason" are all mere well intentioned trash.

It may be justly claimed for a play dealing with such material that simplification must be made. But simplification like that in "If This Be Treason" arrives merely at the infantile. Even the actors, but for their egos, would laugh at it. In drama the right simplification becomes, as it proceeds, not more nurserylike but more inclusive, essential and nearly final, until it arrives at the pregnancy and the outline perfection of myth or parable.

STARK YOUNG.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

The Road to Damascus

LAWRENCE OF ARABIA was a great man: it can now be said simply, without qualifications. After "Revolt in the Desert" there was still room for niggling doubts. That shorter version of his story told only what he saw and dared; it gave readers the privilege to think that he was lucky, was talking big or was claiming honors that belonged to the Arab leaders and to the gruff-but-kindly heroes of the British General Staff. But "Seven Pillars of Wisdom"¹ answers these misgivings. It tells the whole story of his career in Arabia, tells of the plans he made and the intrigues centering round them at army headquarters and the final defeat in the midst of victory. The man can now be measured against the difficulties he had to face, and he becomes vastly more imposing.

Essentially his greatness was that of three ideas which he served at any cost to himself. There was first of all the idea that a rebellion of Arabs against Turks would make it possible for England to win the War in the East. This idea was Kitchener's in the beginning; young Captain Lawrence of the Intelligence Section at Cairo was chosen as one of its minor instruments, and made himself its major instrument through his ability to get inside the minds of the Arabs. Second, there was the idea that the revolt should not be a military matter of drilling armies and besieging fortified cities, that rather it should be a "movement in depth," an upheaval of the whole Arab population. This idea belonged only to Lawrence in the beginning, but he managed to convert a few friends and finally to obtain a benevolent skepticism and millions of gold sovereigns from the General Staff. But the third idea remained his own to the very end, his own and that of his Bedouin allies; he could not share it with other Britons because in effect it was anti-imperialist, anti-British. It was the idea of unity and freedom for the Arabs—the idea that united the quarreling tribes and rolled a wave of rebellion northward "till it reached its crest, and toppled over and fell at Damascus."

No, there can be no question about the greatness of the man who found and released these hidden forces, launching them into the stream of history. There can be no question either that his genius had an unhealthy and sinister side. I am not referring to the strain of homosexual feeling that runs through his book, the continual celebration of male beauty, the apology for those youths of his company who "began indifferently to slake one another's few needs in their own clean bodies." Thus stated, the custom seems Greek or Arab in mood, not unnatural by the standards of men fighting in the wilderness. But Lawrence himself seems more perverted when he continually disparages women, their "sordid commerce," their "raddled meat," and when, after joking with the Bedouins, he suddenly bursts out against "our comic reproductive processes" and shudders at the thought of children crawling wormlike, bloody and blinded, out of their mothers. Here the feeling he reveals is more than negatively sterile, it is actively life-denying and life-destroying. The life of the body seems dirty and defiled, and therefore he prefers the death of the body, the emptiness of the aseptic desert,

the brightness of the sword that brings a clean death. The lusts of the body are sweaty, repulsive, and can neither be killed nor suppressed. There is, however, a keen exaltation in making them even more sordid: "Several, thirsting to punish appetites they could not wholly prevent, took a savage pride in degrading the body, and offered themselves fiercely in any habit which promised physical pain or filth." Briefly, there is material in this book for a compendious treatise on sadism, masochism, necrophilia and their effects on men at war. There are even passages where Lawrence flavors all these vices with a dash of bright pink estheticism, making a cocktail of blood and whipped cream.

In truth there is something profoundly un-English not only in this darker side of his character but also in his special talent for leadership. He becomes easier to understand if we imagine him in Russia during the war between Whites and Reds. Then the one side of him, the ability to understand an oppressed people, to seize and shape their aspiration into a conquering army, immediately suggests one of the great commissars—Frunze or Stalin (or perhaps Michael Borodin in China). The other side, the mixture of reckless bravery with a half-sexual, half-artistic enjoyment of tortures given and taken, suggests one of the White cavalry leaders—perhaps the Cossack general and novelist Krasnov, with a touch of Ataman Semenov. Examples from two sides of the battle are needed to give a fair picture of Lawrence—and that is only natural considering that the man himself was a bundle of opposites, a battleground for opposing armies.

On the one side he was an Englishman, bent on winning the War as soon as possible and using the Arabs only as tools of victory. On the other side he was an Arab, willing to die for his comrades in arms, moved and possessed by their raging lust for freedom not only from the Turks but from France and Britain as well. That was the first and simplest of his conflicts, the one that made him "continually and bitterly ashamed," but it was involved with a dozen others. Thus, on the one side was his loyalty to British imperialism, to the old political structure of the world, and on the other was his dream "of hustling into form, while I lived, the new Asia," in which British imperialism would play no part. Again he complained of "instinct and reason as ever at strong war. Instinct said 'Die,' but reason said that was only to cut the mind to tether, and loose it into freedom: better to seek some mental death, some slow wasting of the brain to sink it beneath these puzzlements." Sometimes two of his hostile selves would talk in the void, "and then madness was very near."

This struggle in Lawrence's mind was no Hegelian dialectic in which thesis and antithesis are resolved into a new synthesis. Here there was no possible marriage of opposites: one side had to win, the other had to perish utterly. For a time the spiritual struggle might be forgotten in the rush northward of the Arab armies, when all the qualities of the man, his loyalty to Britain and the Arabs, his vices, his organizing talent, his love of freedom, could be expressed together in one epic of victory and slaughter. There were nights when "mankind went crazy, when death seemed impossible, however many died to right and left, and when others' lives became toys to break and throw away." There was the day of triumph when Lawrence entered Damascus at the head of the Arabs and "a murmur like a long sigh from gate to heart of the city

¹ Seven Pillars of Wisdom, by T. E. Lawrence. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 672 pages, illustrated. \$5.

marked our course." But the Arabs would be disillusioned soon, and Lawrence would not face their hatred. Three days after their victory, he resigned his powers and rode away. The Briton in him had vanquished the Arab; discipline and instinct had vanquished freedom and reason.

Incidentally, the reason for his later enlistment as a private in the British army is made abundantly clear in "Seven Pillars of Wisdom": it symbolized the end of a tragedy. Lawrence regarded the life of the common soldier as a sort of mental death; the uniform was a token that mind and body, passion and will had been sold to the state. By choosing to wear it he was putting an end to his conflicts; he was finding "a slow wasting of the brain to sink it beneath these puzzlements."

MALCOLM COWLEY.

Labor Boards

Labor Relations Boards: The Regulation of Collective Bargaining under the National Industrial Recovery Act, by Lewis L. Lorwin and Arthur Wubnig. Washington: The Brookings Institution. 457 pages. \$3.

THIS BOOK is a history of the government's experiments with labor boards during the brief life of the National Industrial Recovery Act, from the appointment of the National Labor Board, on August 5, 1933, to the Schechter decision of May 27, 1935, putting an end to the N.R.A. and, incidentally, to the labor boards. It is written with the usual lucidity and objectiveness of the Brookings Institution publications, suggesting but not discussing the broader problems that spring from the relation of government to labor, summarizing the difficulties and limited effectiveness of the various boards. The economic considerations of collective bargaining are not discussed, nor the effect of government "interference" in the development of a labor movement not only facing the unfriendliness of its social setting, but still uncertain of its own direction and purpose. We have, however, a clear historical picture of the government's efforts to further collective bargaining in the brief period that is now so definitely marked off as to be considered a closed chapter in our first attempts at handling industrial disputes.

But the administration's "policy of stimulating and promoting labor self-organization" was not unrelated to the past. In 1918 President Wilson's Mediation Commission recommended that the government's labor policy should admit some form of collective bargaining as indispensable, and should organize appropriate administrative machinery; and the War Labor Board developed the majority-rule doctrine. In 1926 the Railway Labor Act had obligated carriers and employees to "exert every reasonable effort to make and maintain agreements." And in 1930 the Supreme Court (the Texas and New Orleans case) had held that a railroad's attempt to impose a company union upon its employees constituted an unlawful interference with their right to designate their own representatives.

Section 7a, therefore, had a recognized background. That Congress intended it generally to stimulate the trade-union movement can hardly be doubted, or that it was definitely intended to outlaw yellow-dog contracts. But the effect of the section on company unions and the closed shop, and its implication of "recognition" of the union when chosen by a majority, were probably not envisaged at the time. Labor, too easily capable of renewed faith through paper victories, hailed the adoption of the section as its Magna Carta (as, a little later, it hailed the passage of the Wagner-

Connery labor-relations law); and the larger employers, comfortably skeptical, were not deeply concerned. The language of the section was ambiguous; it could be interpreted. Perhaps, after all, it was nothing but a pious wish.

Those friends of labor who are distrustful of any legislation in its behalf as tending to becloud issues and, by delaying more direct action, to weaken union strength, contend (and with reason) that Section 7a never was more than a pious wish, because substantially it was never enforced. The National Labor Board and its successors, the National Labor Relations Board, the Steel Labor Board and the Petroleum Labor Board—these were given limited powers, vaguely expressed. In the ultimate analysis they could do nothing more than make recommendations.

But they did do very much more. They "clarified the ideas underlying the processes of collective bargaining," and built up empirically a body of labor common law; they introduced and applied the new technique of elections to determine representation. In spite of their incidental work in mediation and arbitration, they insisted on the recognition of certain fundamental rights of labor, too often disregarded in the "public" interest of settling at all costs (consider, for instance, the insistence of the N.L.R.B. in the Colt case that the company recognize the union as a union and not merely its individual representatives). They never lost sight of the purpose they conceived to underlie the law—that the aim and end of collective bargaining is the making of collective agreements. They served to inhibit the bitter reaction of labor against a government that had promised so much and accomplished so little; and finally they brought to the public's conception of the problems the realization that policies must be honestly and clearly defined and machinery vigorously strengthened, a realization that led to the adoption of the National Labor Relations Law.

I am in agreement with this study's conclusion that mediation and conciliation should be divorced from the consideration of violations of the law, and should be handled by separate tribunals. Speed is essential in complaints of discrimination as in election proceedings, and mediation tends to delay relief, often irreparably. The new act was, I believe, drawn with this realization, and it is to be hoped that the new national board will function with it in mind—more as a court, and less as a mechanism of adjustment. Such a course will add a sharper reality to its work. But this does not mean that its administrative emphasis must be abandoned. To deal with labor problems from a legalistic angle, to throw them back into courts unfitted by their training, outlook or technique to deal with them realistically, would be fatal to any hope of fair and practical solution.

The book does not touch on an administrative mechanism, used by the N.L.B. and N.L.R.B., that seems to me to have distinct possibilities in the field of mediation. I refer to the "panel" system. Each regional board was composed of leading representatives in the community of industry, of labor, and of the general public, working in collaboration with the regional director. Such panels (there were over six hundred members of the panels when the Schechter case was decided) are probably not adapted to sit on formal hearings as to violations of the law under the new act. But their usefulness in general conciliation work preliminary to the filing of complaints, and in settling disputes not coming under the act, is evident. They exercise an authority and practical knowledge of local conditions that government conciliators cannot enjoy; and their continued use should develop, as it has already developed, a less prejudiced and more human understanding of the problems of labor and industry.

FRANCIS BIDDLE.

One of the Few

The Stars Look Down, by A. J. Cronin. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. \$2.50.

JUDGING only by the stature and intricacy of this novel, one would incline to think of the author's career as meteoric. This has not been the case. Like most great achievements the book is the culmination of lesser endeavors, experiments in the medium embodying a restricted philosophy, a personal moral. It is the logical development from "Hatter's Castle," Dr. Cronin's first novel, published soon after he had given up his medical practice. "Hatter's Castle" was a passionate but unsatisfying book, both in style and subject matter more imitative of the Victorians than integral to our own world. Its interest was chiefly pathological and the suffering described was of a world apart, understandable only as the conclusion drawn from a possible but peculiar premise. One was conscious of a straining to be forceful as if the author were trying to overcome in himself a natural remoteness from human problems.

In this new novel, the remoteness is of a different kind. It is the detachment that comes from complete immersion in the life around one, and it makes the book one of the few in recent times in which an author has dealt with the whole riot of confusion and goodness and waste of life in the modern world, trusting his own vision and without the hypocrisy of a vicarious belief. But there is another side to this quality of detachment; there is in it something of the inadequacy of the cynic. Such a book should print a gigantic question mark on the mind. Instead, the author seems to be giving an answer, a personal answer better suited to the range of his earlier work and leaving one with the impression that the only arms against the sea of troubles presented here are reticence and a cup of tea.

For the purpose of analysis one might call the general theme of the novel the struggle between capital and labor. Actually it is broader, the struggle between those who are not willing to compromise their sense of values in order to prosper under the present system, and those for whom no compromise is necessary, who have in themselves the brutality of the system. The action centers around two families, the Fenwicks who are miners and the family of Richard Barras, mine owner; and one man, Joe Gowlan, who is perhaps too perfect a synthesis of evil—though his change from obnoxious youth to more obnoxious war profiteer and politician is in itself credible and dramatic.

The book covers a period of thirty years. It opens with a strike at the mines, Martha Fenwick silently, bitterly in opposition and her husband Robert silently holding out, knowing there is no alternative. The character of Robert is one of the most beautiful aspects of the book. He is heroic, kindly, reticent, one of the people who endure. When he dies in a mine disaster brought about by Richard Barras' craze for profit, one feels more achievement than loss. His death and that of his comrades, written with terrible restraint, is the supreme commentary on the motives that caused it. With a clarity of construction that Balzac might have been proud of, the author brings his many characters through the War and the hope and disillusionment of the Labor Parliament where David Fenwick tries to obtain justice for the miners, only to go back to the pit, defeated by Gowlan. He goes back to the pit with Barras' son, a neurotic idealist wrecked by the incompatibility of justice and private ownership.

It is impossible to summarize the various threads of story

or the many moods and power of the book. When new social standards come as they must to shove the framework of this story into history, the book will be alive still and memorable for its insight and swiftly moving scenes: the lust and cruelty of Gowlan's maneuvers, the poor relation with the tin of crackers by her bedside, the grotesque downfall of Barras, and the tenderness of the scene in which David, after a defeat in the House, watches the death of his wife Jenny, generous, faithless Jenny dying with a teacup in her hand and her little finger crooked "polite." It is so much of life and in a form so subtle that one forgets, reading, that a pattern has been imposed to make life credible. One may even forget the only thing that has been left out of this pattern, which is the ability in people to refuse defeat and to look down on such drama with something more than the neutrality of stars.

ELEANOR CLARK.

Maimonides

Maimonides: A Biography, by Solomon Zeitlin. New York: Bloch Publishing Company. 245 pages. \$2.

Maimonides (the Rambam), by J. Münz. Translated by Henry T. Schnitckind. Boston: Winchell-Thomas Company. 268 pages. \$1.50.

THESE two books appear on the Maimonides octocentennial, which has been made a public event throughout the Diaspora. Maimonides, aside from having become a sort of Jewish hero, was a many-sided man and his writings have been treated from many points of view. As a Talmudist, he has been admired, discussed, controverted by pious rabbis, who cared nothing about philosophy, as well as by modern specialists. The "Guide of the Perplexed," his master work in philosophy, has given rise to an extensive literature in Hebrew, Latin and modern languages; and such minor works as those on medicine, logic and astronomy have also received attention.

The books under review are mainly concerned with the life of Maimonides and his general characteristics. The biography by Dr. Zeitlin is somewhat disappointing. I find it less interesting than two previous works on the subject: the English memoir by Abrahams and Yellin, and the biography in German by Münz, which Dr. Henry Schnitckind professes to have translated. Since these earlier books were written, manuscripts have been deciphered that throw light on some new aspects of the life of Maimonides.

In his biography Dr. Zeitlin makes full use of the new material and to this extent he improves on his predecessors. But he is too fond of what the Mishna calls "mountains that hang on a hair." Thus, he supposes the modern Zionist movement was anticipated when Maimonides favored Jewish self-government in the Diaspora under secular leadership. A novel and eccentric theory, never suggested by Maimonides himself, converts his code of laws into a Jewish Constitution, made ready for the Messiah who was soon to come. Again, Maimonides should not have been credited with originality in numerous cases where he merely repeats Talmudic dicta, universally accepted. Dr. Zeitlin's book, though having much valuable information, is not altogether a sound one.

From the preface to Dr. Schnitckind's book, it appears that this is to be the first of a series of one hundred popular masterpieces, which are to constitute the Jewish Bookshelf. First came the Bible, and long afterwards

the Talmud; now the passage of the years brings us this "Third Golden Treasury of Jewish Literature." In order to produce a popular life of Maimonides, Dr. Schnitckind has worked over the German original, omitting most of the technical material. So far, so good. But I don't like the additions he has made on his own account. We find some ridiculous flowers of speech, as when the Mishneh Torah (nine-tenths of which is a plain legal code) is compared to a beautiful plant reminding us of the outdoors. And occasionally we find statements such as this: "The poet Immanuel, a friend of Dante, called the 'Inferno' a brilliant work for children, but the 'Guide' a mature book for men." Concerning which one can but say that Immanuel probably never met Dante and certainly made no such remark. If the Jewish Bookshelf is to be a new Bible, this life of Maimonides must be relegated to the Apocrypha.

HARRY S. LEWIS.

Young Prizeman

Four Walls, by Laurence Whistler. New York: The Macmillan Company. 51 pages. \$1.25.

TO HAVE a picture of John Masefield, Laurence Binyon, Walter de la Mare, Gilbert Murray and I. A. Richards with their heads together over the many hundreds of volumes of poems submitted for the award of the King's Medal for poetry, to hear the murmur of critical comment from these judges, or to read their marginalia, would no doubt constitute a literary privilege more diverting, edifying and memorable than actual inspection of the book that won the prize. "Four Walls," by Laurence Whistler, is an average uninformed first book. The author writes oh always with sufficient delicacy, competence and sensitivity, being one of the young English; but there's a lassitude, a sort of weary-mindedness about it, that goes deeper than the mere affectation of youth, as if the land's exhaustion preyed upon the spirit:

A land under the dead glaze of trance,
Utterly still, clear as the face of a pond.
Dead bells in valleys. Discredited phantoms
Among a million eyes. Discords
Sharpening the sensitive, cut away at the roots
In fevered solitude. A land like a youth
Staring into the smoke of a cigarette
Waiting a time, at no particular time.

Mr. Whistler fiddles around—as who, these days, does not?—with internal and off-rhyming, but he does not get very far with it or make anything particular out of it; the poem called "Redbreast" illustrates what happens when a technical essay is full of effects that do not add up. Mr. Whistler is at his best when humbly looking, and simply stating, as in a poem called "The Cemetery." Publishers, we note, are beginning to cry down fashionable obscurity, and proclaim the attractive qualities of moderns who write in a living technique without too much recourse to obsolete idiom.

Mr. Whistler fiddles around—as who, these days, does about it one kind of obscurity; not the obscurity that tries to conceal absence of sense, nor the obscurity that invites the intelligence to penetrate its own arcana, not the obscurity of deliberate ellipsis and personal symbol, but a more inadvertent obscurity that proceeds from the attempt to bring together literary metaphor and inarticulate feeling. His work, both on the technical and emotional side, needs further focus.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES.

Books in Brief

Winning a Wife and Other Stories, by Peter Neagoe. New York: Coward-McCann. \$2.50.

THERE is one trouble with a collection of short stories: a reader is likely to take them down at a gulp and lose their separate flavors. If Neagoe's book is read in the usual abrupt fashion, his very definite and individual talent will slip the attention, his peasant characters will tend to seem all alike in shrewdness and ribald cynicism; the color of the prose itself will blur. For these stories are strictly a story teller's, and need pauses in between. Structurally, the best tales are not short stories, but anecdotes: how one man fooled another into giving him his daughter ("Winning a Wife"), how another was added into believing his wife's word against his own eyes ("Gavril's Confession"). The anecdotes are elaborated as if they were being told aloud with gestures and inflections, and the oral quality makes the characters alive among old situations. Sketches like "A Fact" and "Dreams" are different. They are distinctly a writer's exercises. Neagoe has stopped telling tales, he is writing down random vague thoughts and letting them stand for what they are worth as self-conscious writing. Oddly theoretical, derived and dated, they seem all contrary to the natural bent of Neagoe's talent. And in the American stories, "The Last Call" and "Moonlit River," he is not himself: they are flat and dull because he is relating things seen through somebody else's glasses—Sherwood Anderson's, perhaps. The American scene comes fresh to him, when he is telling the sharp story of "The Greenhorn," when he is back in his own form, the robust form of the Rumanian tales, giving the best of his perpetually pleasant, perpetually unique ability to make a ringing story in prose.

K. W.

Burners of Men, by Marcel Griaule, translated from the French by Edwin Gile Rich. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 308 pages, illustrated. \$2.50.

The crisis over Ethiopia gives a temporary and illusory importance to books like this. Its author was a member of an ethnographic and linguistic mission sponsored by the French Ministry of Public Instruction. The reports of the expedition having been made in scientific periodicals not read by the general public, M. Griaule decided to write a book intended for the public alone. It is the average traveler's tale (the superior rather than the self-deprecatory type) with the customary hardships, river fordings and observed phenomena—including an execution by fire which furnishes the excuse for the questionable title—all written in an irritatingly elliptical style and further confused by a lazy translation.

I. S.

International Socialism and the World War, by Merle Fainsod. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 238 pages. \$2.50.

This little book attempts to tell the complicated story of the international Socialist Movement from the collapse of the Second International to the foundation of the Third. At the outbreak of the War the Socialist parties forgot the class interests of the proletariat and rushed to the defense of their fatherlands. But anti-war sentiment was not completely drowned by the wave of war hysteria. In 1915, pacifist and revolutionary Socialists gathered at Zimmerwald, denounced war as the outcome of imperialism and called upon the workers to strive for peace. While the

International Socialist Bureau, pressed by the rapidly growing Centrist forces to mend the torn fragments of the Second International, found its efforts paralyzed by the respective governments, the Zimmerwald movement constantly gained in strength, and after the Bolshevik victory culminated in the Third International. But Fainsod betrays a superficial grasp of the contradictions inherent in the Second International, attributing the basic cause of its failure to the "disagreements on theory and method," and relegating to a minor place the emasculating effect of imperialism on the international labor movement. The sections on the French minority movements reveal insufficient study; the whole text is burdened with petty details and riddled with contradictions.

S. B.

Plato's Theory of Knowledge, by Francis MacDonald Cornford. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 350 pages. \$4.50.

The Platonic theory of knowledge is here discovered through a new translation and a detailed commentary restricted to two of Plato's most mature and dialectical dialogues: the "Theætetus," wherein Socrates, in the role of intellectual midwife, brings to light the "wind eggs" of Protagoras and Heraclitus; and the "Sophist"—probably the most intricate and exhaustive treatise ever concocted on the meaning of the verb "to be." Happily, by not perverting Plato into the jargon of modern epistemology, Professor Cornford's commentary makes clear that however far Plato may eventually wander on the ocean of forms, he always sets out from the notions and terms of common sense. In addition to its obvious excellence in clarification and summary, the commentary breaks up these long dialogues into well selected and discrete segments, thus enabling you to come up for air or light when you are most likely to need it.

J. V. M.

DANCE

DANCE TO THE ENCHANTING MUSIC OF THE
GROSSINGER'S COUNTRY CLUB
CORAL BAY ORCHESTRA

SATURDAY NIGHT—OCTOBER 12th
at nine

at The Vagabonds Reunion Dance

In the Grand Ballroom of

THE A. W. A. CLUBHOUSE, 361 W. 57th St., N. Y. C.

Admission: With This Notice—75 cents
(West Side Subways to Columbus Circle)

DANCE RECITALS

Eight Dance Recitals, Saturday Evenings

Oct. 12, Nov. 2, Dec. 7, Jan. 11, Feb. 1, Feb. 15, March 14, April 4

CHARLES WEIDMAN and His Group—SHAWN and His Men Dancers—
MIRIAM WINSLOW—TAMIRIS—CAROLA GOYA—MARTHA GRAHAM—
JACQUES CARTIER—AGNES DE MILLE

\$2.50 for the series of eight recitals. Mail orders to Students Dance
Recitals, 32 Union Square. Also on sale at Wanamaker's.
FOR INFORMATION AND TICKETS CALL THIS NUMBER
ONLY: (Stu. 9-1391)

PAUL LUTTINGER, M. D.

and

DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D.

5 Washington Square North

Office hours: 1-2, 6-8

Except Sundays and Holidays

Telephones:

GRamercy 7-2090 — GRamercy 7-2091

SCHOOL

HILL and HOLLOW FARM
HYDE PARK, N. Y.

Home School for Children, aged 2-6. Trained personnel. Medical supervision. A safe, happy, constructive life in the country for normal children. Highly recommended. Directors: Mr. and Mrs. Paul Garrigue, Hyde Park, N. Y. (in Dutchess County, 2 hrs. from New York City). Tel.: Hyde Park 61F31.

Order your books—all books—
mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.

POSTAGE FREE

from NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 East 49th St., New York, N. Y.

23 LANGUAGES

||| SPEAK ANY MODERN LANGUAGE
||| IN 3 MONTHS BY LINGUAPHONE
UNIQUE METHOD BRINGS VOICES
OF NATIVE MASTERS INTO YOUR
OWN HOME.. SEND FOR FREE BOOK |||

LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
41 Rockefeller Center • New York

\$2.50 Monthly, 8 Classes:

French, Spanish, Italian, Russian, German.
\$1 private (full hour). Native instructors.
Language Exchange Center, 67 W. 44th St.,
Tel.: VAnderbilt 3-9646.

POSITION WANTED

SECRETARY, tactful, efficient; excellent stenographer.
Associated 10 years with psychiatrist, author, lecturer.
Valuable publishing experience. Box 896, The New
Republic.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB

IS YOUR LIFE DRAB, COLORLESS? Why
not connect with CONTACTS' 1500 liberal-
minded members? Unusual books loaned
free. Send 3c stamp to CONTACTS, Box 91,
Station D, New York City.

A Delightful Hide-Away

in the mountains inviting people of better
taste. Excellent table, solariums, seasonable
sports. Library, musicals, open fireplaces.

Chesters' Zunbarg

Woodbourne, N. Y. Tel: Fallsburg 2F 22

REAL ESTATE

Values in nearby Connecticut real estate
are worth your investigation now. Let us
show you some immediate opportunities
that involve very little cash. Van Haelewyn
and Walling. Wilton, Conn. Tel. 377 or 272.

**THE SPECIAL CLASSIFIED RATE
OF THE NEW REPUBLIC IS:**

One Inch—1 insertion\$4.00

One Inch—3 insertions\$3.50

One Inch—6 insertions\$3.00

Larger space proportionately more.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

40 East 49th Street, New York, N. Y.